

THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER;
OR,
UNITARIAN
MAGAZINE AND REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, VOL. XIII.

FROM JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1857.

LONDON:
EDWARD T. WHITFIELD, 178, STRAND.
—
1857.

THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXLV.]

JANUARY, 1857.

[VOL. XIII.

MERIVALE'S HISTORY OF THE ROMANS.*

THE name of the author of this work will be read with interest by those who are acquainted with the history of Protestant Dissent. It was borne in the latter half of the eighteenth century by a man eminent for knowledge and liberality of opinion, the Rev. Samuel Merivale, of Exeter, Theological Tutor in the first academical institution in that city.† His grandson, the late John Herrman Merivale, was an elegant scholar and poet; and the author of the work before us is one of a numerous family of great-grandchildren, who by various talent have made the name familiar to the world. The feeling of mortification which we experience when we reckon up the secessions from Presbyterian Dissent to the Established Church, is considerably tempered by the reflection that those who leave us usually carry with them some beneficial influences from their education and connections. Occasionally a deserter, of no esteem among us, betrays the natural feeling of a renegade, by virulence against his former associates and an exaggeration of bigotry; but more commonly the conforming Dissenter will be found in the ranks of moderate and liberal Churchmen. The endless varieties of Dissent forbid the expectation that any one form of it should ever take the place of the Established Church, but its influence on that Church is in many ways beneficial, and not least in leavening it from time to time with men trained to liberality and comprehension of thought, and thereby fitted to correct the narrow tendencies of a ruling sect.

Mr. Merivale's labours on the imperial history of Rome began

* History of the Romans under the Empire. By Charles Merivale, B.D., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Vols. I. and II., 1850; III., 1851; IV. and V., 1856.

† Dr. Kippis, in the Preface to his edition of Doddridge's Lectures, acknowledges his obligations to Mr. Merivale for additional references to that work. We have understood that the late Mr. J. H. Merivale had prepared a Life of his grandfather, illustrated by his correspondence, and exhibiting a very interesting picture of the state of Presbyterian Dissent at the period at which he lived. Mr. Merivale, we perceive by an approving reference to a notice of Zumpt's Dissertation (C. R. XI. 623), is an occasional reader of the Christian Reformer. Should this paper meet his eye, would he allow us to suggest to him that, if the MS. be still in existence, he would do justice to the memory of his ancestor, and render a service to history, by placing it in such a repository as Dr. Williams's Library in Red-cross Street.

with a small volume published by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, and being prevented by its dissolution or suspension from continuing his original plan, he has expanded it into the present voluminous work. We owe therefore to this Society, which it is now the fashion with liberals and illiberals to depreciate and deride, an undertaking which supplies a notable deficiency in our historical literature. The time was come when the history of the overthrow of the Republic required to be written again, after Hooke and Ferguson; and for that of the Empire, before the time when Gibbon begins his Decline and Fall, recourse could be had only to such unattractive writers as Crevier and the Universal History. Mr. Merivale's work, therefore, is very welcome, as occupying a most important period. We may dissent from his views both of the overthrow of the Republic and the characters of the Cæsars, but we have no doubt that it will take a permanent place among our standard histories. Its bulk, indeed, is somewhat alarming; five octavo volumes, of nearly 600 pages each, have only brought us to the poisoning of Cladius, and 276 years have yet to be traversed before the author reaches his terminus, the foundation of Constantinople. The modern practice of publishing large works in small successive portions is a great temptation to diffuseness. The writer takes no just measure of the proportions of his labour, or the relation which a single volume bears to his entire subject. Unless Mr. Merivale compresses his style, he will need as large a space for his four centuries as Gibbon for fourteen.

We purpose to pass, with only a general remark or two, over the history of the overthrow of the Republic, and confine ourselves chiefly to the two last published volumes, which include the reigns of Augustus, Tiberius, Caius (Caligula) and Cladius. Mr. Merivale is decidedly Cæsarean and anti-senatorial in his history of the Civil War. His moral judgment compels him to condemn the notorious profligacy of Cæsar's private life, and he is unable to vindicate many of his political measures; but his evident leaning is to represent him as a man more sinned against than sinning, and to justify his assumption of absolute power. In an age when both public and private morality had reached such a point of degeneracy, it is impossible to arrive at a just verdict by weighing the misdeeds of one side against those of the other. There was no politician of the times, except perhaps Cato, who kept himself pure from illegal acts, and who is not chargeable with selfishness and want of incorruptible patriotism. It is easy, therefore, to make out a case for Cæsar as the victim of an aristocratical faction, and it would be weakness to accept as literal truth the compliments which Cicero pays to his own party as if they were all "boni viri." But, all deduction made for individual misdeeds and unjust party measures on the senatorial side, the broad fact remains that they constituted the legitimate

chief power of the state, and that Cæsar, in order to overthrow them, availed himself of every means with which the corruption and weakness of the commonwealth furnished him. He cannot be allowed to plead this weakness and corruption, which he fostered instead of endeavouring to correct, as a justification for overthrowing the government in which they were inherent. Throughout his whole career he manifested no higher purpose than his own advancement; and the mildness of his temper, when compared with Marius or Sylla, or the projects of public usefulness which he meditated after his usurpation, cannot redeem him from the reproach of having destroyed the constitution of his country. Corruption in the administration of the law is no justification of the overthrow of all law, and the substitution of irresponsible will. And if law is to be respected, it is no light offence to lift the hand of violence against those whom the constitution appoints as its administrators. If the crown of Charles I. had been the emblem of law,—not, as it was, of a prerogative setting itself above the law,—we could have approved the advice of the cavalier to his son, to stand by it, though it hung on a bush. And corrupt as the Roman senate had become, we think it was the duty of good citizens to uphold it when assailed by military violence. Even granting that the time had arrived when an adaptation and reform of the existing constitution was hopeless, we should still condemn the man who availed himself of its condition to accomplish his own ambitious purposes. In this view, Cæsar appears to disadvantage when compared even with Marius and Sylla. They were the fanatics, one of democracy and the other of aristocracy, each striving for the ascendancy of his own exclusive principle and party. But Cæsar's projects were directed solely to his own aggrandizement, and by that fact his character must be judged. It would be equally unfair either to charge on him all the evils which in the course of generations flowed from the establishment of an imperial despotism, or to give him the credit of some incidental benefits which may have resulted from the consolidation of power in a single hand. We cannot accede to Mr. Merivale's views of the principle upon which the historian is to deal out praise and censure of character, when he says (II. 117), "It is not his province to condemn or absolve the great names of human annals. He leaves the philosophical moralist to denounce crimes or errors, upon a full survey of the character and position of the men and their times; but it is his business to distinguish, in analyzing the causes of events, between the personal views of the actors in revolutions and the general interests which their conduct subserved, *and to claim for their deeds the sympathy of posterity in proportion as they tended to the benefit of mankind.*" We do not quite understand the phrase of claiming *sympathy* for the deeds of public men, and can only suppose that Mr. Merivale meant, but shrunk from saying, the

approbation or indulgence of posterity. A Jewish prophet might have given him a clearer insight into an historian's duty. "O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation. I will send him against a hypocritical nation, and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge. Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so; but it is in his heart to destroy and to cut off nations not a few." (Is. x. 5.) Sennacherib's ambition was employed by Providence for the correction of national vices and the consequent "benefit of mankind," but this gained him no sympathy from the prophet for his deeds. Undoubtedly the historian should discriminate between the motives and the results of the actions of public men, but it is for their motives only that he can claim approbation. Cæsar founded a despotism which contained in itself the seeds of corruption and decay; Washington, a free community with the elements of life and growth; but this is not the ground of the difference of our moral judgment of the two men. It is, that we discern in one a selfish ambition, in the other a disinterested patriotism. Mr. Merivale's leaning towards the founder of imperialism at Rome, evidently biasses him in favour of his successors in the empire. What softenings or apologies he may have in store for Domitian or Commodus remains to be seen; but in his history of the reigns of Tiberius, Caius and Cladius, he is ever studious to abate something of the reader's feeling of abhorrence and contempt, and if the facts cannot be called in question, at least to obtain an acquittal on the ground of insanity.

The reign of Augustus, which occupies the last chapters of the third and the whole of the fourth volume of Mr. Merivale's History, exhibits the most favourable aspect of the imperial system, which owed its establishment to him; and the author has given a very comprehensive view of its principles and details. Few readers will be of opinion that after the two civil wars any other form of government was practicable at Rome. Mankind had long been familiar with absolute monarchies; with such oriental history originates; it was upon the ruins of absolute monarchies that the Roman republic had been founded. The peculiarity of the imperial system of Augustus was, that it was established among a people to whom even monarchy had been insufferable, who for centuries had abhorred the name of king, and whose laws, institutions and traditions were all tinged with a republican character. Corrupted as the national character had been, and depressed as all aspirations after liberty were, under the weight of power supported by arms, it was impossible that the new ruler should not be apprehensive of the revival of republican feeling among the people. He had equally to fear that the senatorial order, to whom the honours and prizes of executive government had fallen, would be impatient at seeing their disposal monopolized by one; or that other claimants of power

might arise among the many able and nobly born men whom that order comprehended. The power of Augustus was based neither on hereditary right nor popular election; at most on popular acquiescence; on attachment to the name of Cæsar, and the command of legions whose fidelity was, as regarded *him*, not a sentiment but a mercenary calculation. Nothing but his own exquisite prudence, and the statecraft of his able ministers, could have enabled him to deal with these various difficulties. Instead of the odious name of king, he placed first in his titles, after the example of Julius, the military *imperator*, which carried with it in fact, though not in appearance, an authority far greater than had belonged to the kings. Although his government rested on the soldiery, who swore allegiance to him, and the whole military administration was retained in his hands, he carefully avoided every exhibition of himself to the people in his military functions, and allowed no troops to occupy the city. The title of *Princeps* implied only a presidency, freely accorded by the senate to the most distinguished of their members; the consulship and proconsulship were pre-eminently republican titles; and the tribunitial power, which he took to himself, seemed to connect him directly with the popular element in the state, while it conferred on him the sacrosanct character by which the plebeian magistracy had been guarded. The penalties of the indefinite crime of *majestas* or high treason, originally designed to protect the liberties of the people, now became the safeguard of the usurper of those liberties. As *Pontifex Maximus* he was Head of the Church and had the state religion under his control, an important prerogative among a people in whom superstition became more rife as true piety declined. But he left to the senate the rights of formal legislation, secure of being always able to obtain his purposes by the less obnoxious methods of suggestion and initiation, and never claimed for his own edicts an authority equal or superior to the laws.* He deprived the people of their elective franchises and their judicial power, but kept them quiet and in good humour by donatives of corn, by public spectacles and the embellishment of the capital. Such were the balanced and stealthy steps by which the advances of absolute power were made. We have briefly indicated them; the reader will find them clearly and amply stated in the pages of Mr. Merivale.

So far the policy of Augustus appears simply selfish, and directed by the desire of consolidating the power which he had seized. In his organization of the state and the empire, in his

* Mr. Merivale explains very well (II. 488) the exaggerations by which the courtly lawyers of later times endeavoured to make it appear that the emperor's edicts had always possessed the force of law. This doctrine still infects the codes of continental monarchies, and but for the determined stand of our common lawyers might have found its way into our own.

religious and moral legislation, in his patronage of literature and art, and in the maxims of policy which he bequeathed to his successor, we see the sagacious statesman, alive to all the difficulties of his position, and while anxiously providing means to perpetuate the system which he had established, endeavouring also to promote the public welfare. The interests of public order were concerned in the character of the senate; it was still in theory a co-ordinate power with that of the emperor, though doomed to be subordinate whenever an opposition of will arose. One of his first undertakings, while he yet bore only the name of Octavius, was to purify this body from the unworthy members who had found their way into it (among whom of course were reckoned the most ardent of the republicans), and to supply their place with others who, while they were attached to his cause, might by their property and character give weight to the senatorial order. As a patriot, Augustus must have regretted that religion had lost its ancient influence over the Roman mind,* during the crimes and turmoil of the civil war; as an absolute ruler, he set the example of seeking a powerful ally in the influence of the priesthood. He restored the ruined temples and renewed their ceremonies, giving especial honour to Apollo, to whom he built a temple on the Palatine Hill.† He laboured earnestly, but ineffectually, to correct the disposition of the Romans to live in a state of licentious celibacy, rather than contract a legitimate marriage. His laws and exhortations might have been more successful, had he practised in youth the doctrine which he preached in middle life and in old age, or if the Romans had not remembered the morals of the divine Julius.

The civil wars had suspended the progress of the Roman arms, and prevented the thorough incorporation of the recent conquests. Augustus, though not inclined by policy to war, nor possessed of marked military talent, was aware that his empire could have no stability or coherence till all within its limits was

* Polybius, vi. 56. He calls it *δεισιδαιμονία*, evidently using the word in a bad sense.

† Mr. Merivale adds, that to honour him he transplanted to Rome an obelisk from Heliopolis. We know not on what authority he supposes that this was done in honour of Apollo. The notion that the pointed summit of the obelisk represented flame and the sun's ray, is a fancy of the older Egyptologists. The obelisk was the Egyptian *stele*, erected as much for the glory of the monarch who inscribed it with his shield, as the god whose titles it bore. Mr. Merivale goes on—"It is interesting to trace an intelligible motive for the first introduction into Europe of these grotesque and unsightly monuments of Eastern superstition." Tastes differ, and it is not fair to judge of the obelisk when torn from its original position and associations. As a form of honorary record, it is much more rational than the column, which, after the example of the Romans, we have detached from the architrave, in union with which it alone has a meaning, and made the mere pedestal of a colossal statue. We think a more intelligible motive for the removal of an Egyptian trophy might be found in the desire of Augustus to signalize to the Romans his victory over Antony and Cleopatra, "ausa Jovi nostro latrantem opponere Anubim," (Prop. iii. 2, 41.)

brought into peaceful subjection. He finished the protracted war in Spain and appeased the discontents of Gaul. From the inhabitants of Britain no active hostility was to be feared; and though his flatterers announced that he was about to lead the Britons in chains along the Sacred Way, he contented himself with the promise of tribute.* By the subjugation of the wild Alpine tribes, commemorated on the monument which the traveller still sees at La Turbia, he secured a speedy communication between Gaul and Italy. Egypt, the granary of Rome, was protected from the invasion of the Ethiopians, and its administration committed to functionaries of a humble class, that there might be the less risk lest an aspirant to the throne should starve Italy into submission. The honour of the empire was retrieved by the recovery of the standards lost at Carrhæ. In expeditions beyond the frontiers Augustus was less successful. The attempt of Ælius Gallus to possess himself of the "intactæ Arabum opes," ended in the destruction of great part of his army by fatigue and sickness; and the invasion of North Germany brought down upon Rome a calamity only equalled by the defeat of Crassus—the loss of Varus and his legions.

In the patronage of literature, which has gained so much glory for him and his minister Mecænas, a political motive is transparently shewn. We think perhaps too much of Louis XIV. when we attribute to Augustus the desire of shining in the eyes of the world and being celebrated by posterity, through the reflected light of the men of genius whom he collected around him; but there can be no doubt that he used their talents as a means of reconciling the Roman people to his government, and exhibiting him to them in a favourable point of view. Virgil, in his Eclogues, celebrates his clemency, and anticipates the return of the golden age. In his Georgics, he represents the sun as mourning for the death of Cæsar, and implores the gods of his country that Augustus might stay the curse which seemed to cleave to the Roman people. The Æneid is devoted to the glorification of the Julian family, as the descendants of Venus and Æneas. Horace, slender as his faith in the gods was, could see Augustus seated among them in Olympus, and sipping nectar, with a countenance radiant with heavenly light. The influence of the Epicurean philosophy which pervades those of his works in which he allows us to see his real sentiments, tended to cool all ardent feelings of patriotism, and induce the turbulent spirits of his time to acquiesce in a government which maintained order and promoted material comfort. We cannot deny to Augustus the praise of admirable

* Such at least is the common representation which Mr. Merivale follows. He has not noticed the fragment of Livy, produced by Schneidewin (Verhandl. des Philogenvereins, 1843), "Cæsar Augustus populo Romano nuntiat, *regressus a Britannia insula, totum orbem terrarum tam bello quam amicitiis Romano imperio subditum.*" We still doubt if Augustus ever set foot in Britain.

tact and skill in the measures which he adopted to tranquillize the Roman people, and prevent their regretting their lost liberties. Yet after all he was a heartless man, devoid of any great and generous purpose, and it could only be by a complacent self-deception that he closed his life with the belief that he had acted his part well. Mr. Merivale thus describes his death-bed :

"The closing scene of this illustrious life has been portrayed for us with considerable minuteness. It is the first natural dissolution of a great man we have been called upon to witness, and it will be long, I may add, before we shall assist at another. Let us observe it and reflect upon it. On the morning of his death, being now fully sensible of his approaching end, Augustus inquired whether there were any popular excitement in anticipation of his approaching end. Being no doubt reassured upon this point, he called for a mirror, and desired his grey hairs and beard to be decently arranged. Then asking of the friends around him whether he had played well his part in the drama of life, he muttered a verse from a comic epilogue inviting them to greet his last exit with applause.* He made some inquiries after a sick grandchild of Tiberius, and falling at last into the arms of Livia, had just strength, in the last moment of expiring, to recommend to her the memory of their long union. His end was perfectly tranquil. He obtained the euthanasia he had always desired, very different, but not less in harmony with his character, from that of his predecessor. There was no cynicism, at least to my apprehension, in the gentle irony with which, at the moment of death, he sported with the vanities of a human career. Though cheered with no religious hope for himself, nor soothed by any deep-felt yearnings towards his survivors, he was supported on the verge of the abyss by the unfailing power of national sentiments, and the strong assurance that he had confirmed by a great achievement the fortunes of the Roman state."—IV. 378, 379.

When our author proceeds to observe that he "looked back on the horrors in which his career commenced without blenching," we have no doubt that he is right as to the fact; but when he explains his calmness by saying, "He had made peace with himself, to whom alone he felt himself responsible; neither God nor man, in his view, had any claim upon him,"—he assumes a knowledge of his interior sentiments for which he produces no authority. There is no evidence that he was ever otherwise than at peace with himself; to suppose that he had once been troubled with qualms of conscience, and had stilled them by the reflection that he was irresponsible, is to attribute to him a degree of moral sensibility which nothing shews him to have possessed. Mr. Merivale is fond of these psychological speculations, which appear to us in general very fanciful. He is more successful in his picture of manners, and the following description of a Roman noble's

* "Suet. 1. c. Ecquid iis videretur vite commode transegisse....adjecit et clausulam : εἰ δὲ πᾶν ἔχει καλῶς, τῷ παγνίῳ Δότε κρότον, καὶ πάντες ὑμεῖς μετὰ χαρᾶς κτυπήσατε. Comp. Dion. lvi. 30." Mr. Merivale prints these verses as if, like the Swiss editor Bremi, he considered them as *Troch. tetr. catal.*, but they should be divided at πᾶν and κρότον, and then are plainly *Iamb. sen.*

day is a favourable specimen of the skill with which he combines in one picture the scattered notices of the classics :

"The Roman noble rose ordinarily at daybreak, and received at his levée the crowd of clients and retainers who had thronged the steps before his yet closed door from the hours of darkness. A few words of greeting were expected on either side, and then, as the sun mounted the eastern sky, he descended from his elevated mansion into the Forum. He might walk surrounded by the still lingering crowd, or he might be carried in a litter ; but to ride in a wheeled vehicle on such occasions was no Roman fashion. Once arrived in the Forum, he was quickly immersed in the business of the day. He presided as a judge in one of the basilicas, or he appeared himself before the judges as an advocate, a witness or a suitor. He transacted his private affairs with his banker or notary ; he perused the Public Journal of yesterday, and inquired how his friend's cause had sped before the tribunal of the prætor. At every step he crossed the path of some of the notables of his own class, and the news of the day and interests of the hour were discussed between them with dignified politeness.

"Such were the morning occupations of a *dies fastus*, or working day ; the holy day had its appropriate occupation in attendance upon the temple services, in offering a prayer for the safety of the emperor and people, in sprinkling frankincense on the altar, and on occasions of special devotion, appeasing the gods with a sacrifice. But all transactions of business, secular or *divine*, ceased at once when the voice of the herald on the steps of the Hostilian Curia proclaimed that the shadow of the sun had passed the line on the pavement before him, which marked the hour of midday. Every door was now closed ; every citizen, at least in summer, plunged into the dark recesses of his sleeping chamber for the enjoyment of his meridian slumber. The midday siesta terminated, generally speaking, the affairs of the day, and every man was now released from duty and free to devote himself, on rising again, to relaxation or amusement till the return of night. If the senate had been used sometimes to prolong or renew its sittings, there was a rule that after the tenth hour, or four o'clock, no new business could be brought under its notice, and we are told of Asinius Pollio that he would not even open a letter after that hour. Meanwhile Rome had risen again to amuse and recreate itself, and the grave man of business had his amusements as well as the idler of the Forum. The exercises of the Field of Mars were the relaxation of the soldiers of the republic ; and when the urban populace had withdrawn itself from military service, the traditions of the Campus were still cherished by the upper ranks, and the practice of its mimic war confined, perhaps, exclusively to them. The swimming, running, riding, and javelin-throwing of this public ground became under the emperors a fashion of the nobility : the populace had no taste for such labours, and witnessed perhaps with some surprise the toils to which men voluntarily devoted themselves, who possessed slaves to relieve them from the most ordinary exertions of the day. But the young competitors in these athletic contests were not without a throng of spectators : the porticos which bordered the field were crowded with the elder people and the women, who shunned the heat of the declining sun : many a private dwelling looked upon it from the opposite side of the river, which was esteemed on that account a desirable place of resi-

dence. Augustus had promised his favour to every revival of the gallant customs of antiquity, and all the Roman world that lived in his smiles hastened to the scene of these antique amusements to gratify the emperor, if not to amuse themselves.

"The ancients, it was said, had made choice of the Field of Mars for the scene of their mimic warfare for the convenience of the stream of the Tiber, in which the wearied combatants might wash off the sweat and dust, and return to their companions in the full glow of recruited health and vigour. But the youth of Rome in more refined days were not satisfied with these genial ablutions. They resorted to warm and vapour baths, to the use of perfumes and cosmetics, to enhance the luxury of refreshment; and sought by various exquisite devices to stimulate the appetite for the banquet which crowned the evening."—V. 549—553.

We have before remarked on the extenuating tone which characterizes Mr. Merivale's account of the reigns of Tiberius, Caligula and Claudius,—a tone caught from recent continental writers, in whom its motive is evident, a desire to lessen the opprobrium which tyranny has attached to arbitrary power. We attribute no such purpose to Mr. Merivale. Livy gives two motives which a writer may have for handling anew a familiar subject of history, either the possession of more accurate information, or the hope of surpassing former historians in the art of narration. "Novi semper scriptores, aut in rebus certius aliquid adlaturos se, aut scribendi arte rudem vetustatem superaturos credunt." (Præf.) To these we are inclined to add a third, the desire of putting a new face upon old facts, and shewing the world how they have been hitherto misled in judging of characters and events. The temptation to this is peculiarly strong in the case of ancient history, the materials for which have received no important additions for two centuries and a half. The popular conviction, however, being generally established on pretty strong testimony of classic authors, to excite a suspicion of their accuracy, their wisdom or their impartiality, is a necessary preliminary to the introduction of novel views. Mr. Grote found Thucydides an obstacle to his favourable opinion of Athenian democracy. Niebuhr set down Isocrates as "an ineffable fool," because he judged it for the interest of Athens to place itself under the *hegemonia* of Philip. Mr. Merivale thinks the Roman historians have been in league to blacken the character of the Cæsars, and, like Napoleon, deems Tacitus to have been a calumniator. There is truth in the observation which he introduces from Dion Cassius, that from the cessation of the republic the sources of history became more obscure and private. Everything before had been done in public; now the springs of events are hidden in the recesses of a palace, or even in the meditations and emotions of a single mind. This is true of every absolute government as compared with a republic, unless an ample literature of Memoirs reveals to us the real motives of the actors in public life. Another circumstance places the history of the first Cæsars in unfavourable contrast

with that of the last days of the republic—we have no contemporaneous historian, if we except Velleius for the early part of the reign of Tiberius. But though this may make the history less certain, we see no reason why it should give a bias against the Cæsars. Mr. Merivale systematically depreciates all those writers who are opposed to the imperial despotism. He intimates that the reason why the latter part of Livy's *Decades* has been lost, was that symptoms of the garrulity of old age appeared in it. This is but an illnatured suggestion. Surely the fact that the History consisted of 142 Books is sufficient to account for its imperfect preservation. It is not because Polybius and Diodorus had outlived their faculties that more than half their works has been lost. In the long journey to posterity, a voluminous author was very likely in ancient times to lose some part of his baggage. And if a reason be asked why the contemporary portion of Livy's History has entirely perished while others have been preserved, it might be plausibly answered, Because he was a Pompeian, and it might not have been safe to possess a copy of a work reflecting on the founder of the imperial family.

Our chief authorities for the imperial history are Dion Cassius, Suetonius and Tacitus. The first of them is a compiler of no extraordinary sagacity, whom we value chiefly because he had access to many authorities lost to us, and because his high station enabled him to consult the public records. Suetonius was a collector and retailer of anecdotes, honest and faithful for anything that appears, but not critical in regard to evidence, nor discriminating in regard to probability. Tacitus, however, from whom we have a pretty complete history of the reign of Tiberius, and again of Claudius and Nero, has been generally received as an unimpeachable authority, conversant alike with the world and with letters, and if stern and severe in his judgment of character, at least free from all corrupting influences. It is impossible to be the apologist of the Cæsars without impugning either the judgment or the motives of Tacitus. Mr. Merivale, if he doubted either, was of course perfectly at liberty to call them in question. But we think the reader of his History has a right to complain, that instead of doing this with an open and full statement of his reasons at the point where his own judgment and that of Tacitus first come into opposition, he has deferred this statement till he reaches the age in which Tacitus lived. His theory is, that to exalt the glory of the reign of Trajan, he has darkened the shades in the characters of the first Cæsars; and that in his mind and that of the Romans of his day, there was a disposition to exaggerate the evils of the Cæsars' tyranny, in order to enhance the rare felicity of their own times. Meanwhile, though withholding the proofs, whatever they may be, of such a bias on the mind of Tacitus, he takes credit for them by anticipation, and damages his authority by incidental remarks. Thus, speaking of the

retirement of Mecænas from power, he says, “There seems on the whole no reason to seek for the motives of the minister’s retirement, least of all to ascribe it with Tacitus, esteemed, and generally not without reason, an eminently philosophical historian, to the blind agency of Fate.” (IV. 250.) The words of Tacitus are (speaking, Ann. iii. 30, of Salustius Crispus, who in his latter years had lost the confidence of the emperor), “Idque et Mecænati acciderat, fato potentiae raro sempiternæ; an satias capit, aut illos, cum omnia tribuerunt, aut hos cum jam nihil reliquum est quod cupiant.” May not an historian say that it is “the destiny of immoderate power (the true meaning of *potentia*) rarely to be permanent,” without being chargeable with exalting Fate into a blind agent in human affairs? Tacitus himself goes on to assign two philosophical causes for this instability of power, the weariness of giving on the one side, indifference to the gift on the other. Speaking of the authorities for the history of the empire, he says (IV. 608), “The guides who will deign to aid us will prove too often blind and treacherous; and we shall march like the hero of Virgil in the infernal twilight by the malign rays of Tacitus and Suetonius, through the gloom of a tyranny which has overshadowed men and things, and confused the various colours of events and characters.” This *transprosing** of Virgil’s imagery is not in the best taste in an historian, but, more than that, it is unjust. The scholar knows that the *maligna lux* of Virgil has no character of malignity, and merely expresses a scanty and dubious light; transferred to English, the word insinuates a grave charge of wilful misrepresentation, while the author may still say that he has used it in the classical and not the ordinary sense. Mr. Merivale omits no opportunity of exciting distrust in his reader’s mind against Tacitus. The historian winds up his account of the suicide of Piso by saying, that he had heard old people mention that Piso had been assassinated, in order to prevent his laying before the senators some papers which would have revealed the guilt of Tiberius, adding, “Quorum neutrum asseveraverim; neque tamen oculere debui narratum ab iis qui nostram ad juventutem duraverunt.” (Ann. iii. 16.) On these words Mr. Merivale makes the following comment:

“The writer concludes this narration, however, with cautioning the reader that he does not affirm this circumstance as an ascertained fact; and such, it must be remarked, is too frequently his habit, to be excused, perhaps, only from the paucity of really trustworthy documents in his reach—to insinuate the truth of popular rumours, under pretence of merely recounting them. It is not too much to assert that he really means us to believe most of the stories he thus repeats, under the pro-

* Mr. Merivale is seldom happy in inlaying his prose with fragments of poetry. He calls liberty (V. 167) “the prime jewel of a Roman’s existence.” Shakespeare had made Diana, in All’s Well that Ends Well, call chastity “the jewel of our house, bequeathed down by many ancestors”—a precious heirloom. But what is the “prime jewel of existence”?

test that he cannot actually vouch for them. With this caution against the seductive influence of the most eloquent of historians, I return to the narrative before us."—V. 105.

The words of Tacitus are before our readers, and they can judge whether they justify Mr. Merivale's imputation. They seem to us to express simply the duty of an historian in cases of doubtful testimony; and there is an affectation of candour in the excuse offered. The paucity of historical documents affords an opportunity to an artful historian to insinuate what he did not venture to affirm; how it could excuse him for such baseness we are unable to see. And if, now and then, public men, whose indisputable actions make the worst things credible, have their crimes exaggerated, we feel little interest in lightening the load. There cannot be a more just retribution, than that those whose tyranny has stifled the voice of historical truth should themselves suffer by its suppression.

Mr. Merivale has traced minutely the unfavourable influences under which the character of Tiberius was formed. His temper was naturally unamiable and his manners unpopular; he had been kept in the back ground by Augustus for many years; he knew that the affections of the people were fixed on Germanicus; he lived in constant apprehension that the old republican spirit might revive and overturn the imperial power. These and many other causes which might be enumerated,—above all, the fatal gift of unlimited authority,—contributed to the gradual deterioration of a character which, though it could never have been attractive, might have escaped censure. These circumstances may serve to explain the depth of moral degradation which Tiberius reached in the latter years of his reign, though we think Mr. Merivale approaches very near the fatalism with which he charges Tacitus, when he says (V. 91), "There are positions in life in which such men are unavoidably thrust into crimes, and into such we shall soon find Tiberius impelled without the power of resistance." In a subsequent passage of his History, he appears to think that his atrocities must be attributed to an hereditary taint in the blood of the Claudii, which sometimes shewed itself in extravagant pride and insolence, at others in ungovernable violence. This fashion of giving the name of insanity to the perversion of a selfish mind, has lately made its appearance in our courts of justice, but has been repudiated by the common sense of Englishmen. They have refused to acknowledge that a man can be released from moral responsibility by the surrender of himself to an intense hatred or a passionate desire. Tacitus more justly draws the inference from the mental misery of Tiberius, that tyrants are their own tormentors. "Neque frustra præstantissimus sapientiæ firmare solitus, si recludantur tyrannorum mentes, posse aspici laniatus et ictus; quando ut corpora verberibus, ita sævitia, libidine, malis con-

sultis animus dilaceratur. Quippe Tiberium non fortuna, non solitudines protegebant, quin tormenta pectoris suasque ipse poenas fateretur." (Ann. vi. 6.) It is but fair to Mr. Merivale to allow him to justify in his own words the lenity with which he is inclined to treat Tiberius.

"If we examine the authorities for the history of the reign we have been reviewing, we shall find that those who were nearest to the times themselves have generally treated Tiberius with the greatest indulgence. Velleius Paterculus indeed, and Valerius Maximus, his contemporaries and subjects, must be regarded as mere courtly panegyrists; but the adulation of the one, though it jars on ears accustomed to the dignified self-respect of the earlier Romans, is not more highflown in language and sentiment than what our own writers have addressed to the Georges, and even the Charleses and Jameses, of the English monarchy; while that of the other is chiefly offensive from the connexion in which it stands with the lessons of virtue and patriotism which his book was specially designed to illustrate. The elder Seneca, the master of a school of rhetoric, to which science his writings are devoted, makes no mention of the emperor under whom he wrote; but his son, better known as the statesman and philosopher, though he was under the temptation of contrasting the austere and aged tyrant with the gay young prince to whom he was himself attached, speaks of him with considerable moderation, and ascribes the worst of his deeds to Sejanus and the declators, rather than to his own evil disposition. In the pages of Philo and Josephus, the government of Tiberius is represented as mild and equitable; it is not till we come to Suetonius and Tacitus, in the third generation, that his enormities are blazoned in the colours so painfully familiar to us. It will suffice here to remark that both these later writers belong to a period of strong reaction against the Cæsarcan despotism, when the senate was permitted to raise its venerable head and assume a show at least of its old imperial prerogatives; when the secret police of Rome was abolished, delation firmly repressed, freedom of speech proclaimed by the voice of the emperor himself, and the birth-right of the Roman citizen respectfully restored to him. There ensued a strong revulsion of feeling, not against monarchy, which had then become an accepted institution, but against the corruptions which had turned it into tyranny; and Tiberius, as the reputed founder of the system of delation, bore the odium of all the crimes of all the tyrants who had succeeded him. Tacitus admits that the *affairs of Tiberius* were misrepresented during his power by fear, and after his death by spite: yet we cannot doubt that Tacitus himself often yields to the bias of his detractors, while Suetonius is at best indifferent to the truth. After all, a sober discretion must suspend its belief regarding many of the circumstances above recorded, and acknowledge that it is only through a treacherous and distorting haze that we have scanned the features of this ill-omened principate."—V. 334—336.

A more plausible plea might be urged on behalf of Caligula and Claudius, since the former was subject to epilepsy, and the latter so notorious for the weakness of his intellect, that he had been treated as little better than an idiot by his mother, by Augustus and Tiberius. But there is no ground for supposing

that disease in the one case, or imbecillity in the other, though it may have increased the power of animal desires and hardened the heart against sympathy, so far impaired the understanding as to take away moral responsibility. Caligula's is an intelligible character; brutal passions had unchecked sway over him; but Claudius is a paradox. In his uncouthness, his pedantry, his weak submission to the influence of others, he reminds us of our own James I., while the vigour and success of his public measures may be compared with those of Elizabeth or Cromwell. Mr. Merivale has observed that his merit consisted in his close imitation of the measures of Augustus; and the remark is just; the marvel is, that endeavouring to tread in his steps “*haud passibus æquis,*” he should generally have followed his track so successfully. He re-established the ascendancy of Rome on the Rhine; he resumed, and in great measure accomplished, the subjugation of Britain; he founded new colonies, renewed the senatorial and equestrian orders, devoted himself to the administration of justice, and endeavoured by legislation to reform the public morals. But, in his station, weakness was as pernicious as evil dispositions, and the influences to which he submitted himself perverted all that was good in his nature and aggravated all that was bad. Hence the bloody tyranny of the latter years of his reign. Mr. Merivale would fain find a reason for disbelieving the accounts which have come down to us of the vices of Messalina. We cannot wonder that a man of benevolence, whose duty compels him to detail these revolting stories, should seek relief from an oppressive weight, by persuading himself that such enormities are simply incredible. In an age, however, so thoroughly corrupt as its own literature shews that of the Cæsars to have been, it is difficult to fix the limit to which profligacy and impudence may proceed. We conclude our extracts with the summary of the character of Claudius.

“We meet with more than one instance in the imperial history of the parents suffering for the sins of their children. We have already seen how much reason there is to believe that the hatred of the Romans to Tiberius disposed them readily to accept any calumny against Livia. Tiberius himself was hated the more for the crimes of his successor Caius; and there is ground to surmise that much of the odium which has attached to Claudius is reflected from the horror with which Nero came afterwards to be regarded. Thus did the Romans avenge themselves on the authors of the principle of hereditary succession, so long unknown to their polity, and known at last so disadvantageously. Of Claudius, at least, a feeling of compassion, if not of justice, may incline us to pronounce with more indulgence than has usually been accorded to him. He was an imitator, as we have seen, of Augustus, but only as the silver age might parody the golden; for the manners he sought to revive, and the sentiments he pretended to regenerate, had not been blighted by the passing tempest of civil war, but were naturally decaying from the over-ripeness of age. Nevertheless, it was honourable to

admire a noble model: there was some generosity even in the attempt to rival the third founder of the state. Nor, in fact, does any period of Roman history exhibit more outward signs of vigorous and successful administration: none was more fertile in victories, or produced more gallant commanders or excellent soldiers; domestic affairs were prosperously conducted; the laborious industry of the emperor himself tired out all his ministers and assistants. The senate recovered some portion of its authority, and with authority of courage and energy. Claudius secured respect for letters, in an age of show and sensuality, by his personal devotion to them. From some of the worst vices of his age and class he was remarkably exempt. His gluttony, if we must believe the stories told of it, was countenanced at least by many high examples; his cruelty, or rather his callous insensibility, was the result of the perverted training which made human suffering a sport to the master of a single slave, as well as to the emperor on the throne; and it was never aggravated at least by wanton caprice or ungovernable passion. The contempt which has been thrown upon his character and understanding has been generated, in a great degree, by the systematic fabrications of which he has been made the victim. Though flattered with a lip-worship which seems to our notions incredible, Claudius appears to have risen personally above its intoxicating vapours; we know that in one instance at least, the fulsome adulation of a man the most remarkable of his age for eloquence and reputed wisdom, failed to turn the course whether of his justice or his anger."—V. 596—598.

Mr. Merivale's style is forcible and lively, but it is deficient in precision and often offends against good taste. Indeed, the pure, simple, dignified historical style seems to have forsaken our literature, and to have taken refuge in America with Prescott and Washington Irving. He deals profusely in epithets, which have often no special congruity or authority, but come along with certain substantives, as if by frequent association they had acquired the right always to appear in their company. It is curious to see how the simple expressions of the ancients are sometimes *frothed up* in the translation in order to make the narrative appear more graphic and the sentiment more intense. Where his authority makes the senators proceed in a body to the Capitol, he makes them "rush tumultuously;" instead of "the consuls arose," we have "the consuls sprang to their feet,"—a Scotticism, by the way, which has only crossed the Tweed within the last few years. Suetonius says of Caligula, "Incitabatur insomnia maxime, neque enim plus quam tribus nocturnis horis quiescebat; ac ne his quidem placida quiete, sed pavida miris rerum imaginibus: ut qui inter cæteras pelagi quondam speciem colloquenter se cum videre visus sit. Ideoque magna parte noctis, vigiliæ cubandique tædio, nunc toro residens nunc per longissimas porticus vagus, invocare identidem atque expectare lucem consuerat" (50). This is Mr. Merivale's expansion of the passage:

"Through the weary darkness of the night he would toss in listless

agitation on his bed, or pace with hurried and unequal strides the long-resounding corridors, shouting impatiently for the dawn. His dreams were wild and terrible, and in his waking visions his mind seemed ever on the stretch with the vastness of its shadowy images, in which he fancied he beheld the great Spirit of the Ocean, and engaged in converse with him. The might and majesty of the Cœsarean empire, as of a Titan that defied the Gods, inflamed his perturbed imagination; his conceptions expanded like the welling visions of a dream, and his grasp of power was a fitful struggle to realize a sick man's nightmare.”—V. 363, 364.

Mr. Merivale characterizes a passage in Tacitus as being “a clang of turgid extravagance” (V. 51, note). Might not the venerable ancient have his retort? Though the Muse of history is often mounted on stilts in his pages, she now and then descends to a very plebeian level, as when it is said of Ovid (IV. 342) that “he got mixed up in the hazardous intrigues of the time.” The author’s meaning is sometimes confused by the double refraction of mixed metaphors, e.g., “The drop of pious sentiment enshrined in either view, served in some measure to purify the turbid elements of which, at this period, the mass of the Roman people was composed” (IV. 13). St. Januarius’ phial enables us to conceive of the enshrinement of a drop, and we have seen a lecturer on chemistry purify turbid elements by a drop; but we are quite baffled when we endeavour to form an idea how such an effect should be produced by a “drop enshrined in a view.” It is to be regretted that a work of so much learning and ability should be disfigured by such faults as these, and still more that the author should apparently regard them as beauties.

K.

ON THE SYRIAC GOSPEL USED BY HEGESIPPUS.

SIR,

THERE is a passage in Eusebius, relative to Hegesippus, on which I should be obliged to some of your learned readers if they could throw any light. Hegesippus, I need hardly mention, was a Jewish Christian who flourished about the middle of the second century, and wrote a history of the Apostolic Preaching in five books.* Eusebius (H. E. iv. 22) says, that Hegesippus derived the materials of his history from the four following sources: “the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the *Syriac Gospel*, some things peculiar to himself from the Hebrew (Aramaean?) dialect (shewing himself to be a believer of the Hebrews), and others, as if taken from unwritten Jewish tradition.” I sub-

* Παράδοσιν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος (Euseb. H. E. iv. 8). “Omnis a passione Domini usque ad suam ætatem Ecclesiasticorum Actuum texens historias.” (Jerome, De Vir. Illustr. 22.)

join the original in the margin.* This passage instructively illustrates the mode in which the earliest Christian history was put together, and the various elements which entered into its composition; how the numerous ἐξηγήσεις and διηγήσεις, of which the curious fragment of Papias gives us an account (Euseb. H. E. iii. 39), and to which the preface of Luke's Gospel very distinctly alludes, were constructed out of different materials. We find here mentioned in the first place, as of first authority, works which had assumed the complete form of regular evangelical histories or gospels, such as the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which we know, from many passages in Jerome who had resided in Palestine and was likely to be acquainted with the fact, was the Gospel in common use among the Nazarenes and Ebionites (so the Jewish Christians of his day were called in contradistinction from the Catholics), and bore a close affinity to our Matthew. As Hegesippus was a zealous Jewish Christian (we may infer from his description of the martyrdom of James the Just, that he was an Ebionite, Euseb. H. E. ii. 23), we are not surprised to find the Gospel according to the Hebrews among the sources used by him. Besides pre-existing Gospels, detached accounts of particular discourses or particular transactions, couched in the native Palestinian dialect, furnished other materials peculiar to the compiler; and this is what seems to be expressed in the *iδίως* of the foregoing statement. Lastly, oral tradition opened a copious source of additional information. Papias tells us (Euseb. H. E. iii. 39) how careful he was to interweave with his λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγησίς, whatever he had learned by word of mouth from the elders who were acquainted with the apostles.

But the circumstance to which I wish particularly to direct attention in the passage before us, is the Gospel here associated with that of the Hebrews—τὸ Συριακὸν; for that ἑναγγέλιον must here be understood, is evident from the use of the correlative conjunctions *τε* and *καὶ*, so that we might render the passage,—“from both the Hebrew and the Syriac Gospel.” What was this Syriac Gospel? Heinichen, the modern editor of Eusebius, and the late Dr. Routh in his *Reliquiae Sacræ*, unaccountably pass over the statement without a comment; and Dr. Lardner, in his chapter on Hegesippus, is hardly more satisfactory. It cannot be the Peschito, usually considered the oldest version extant of the New Testament, if Hegesippus wrote about the middle of the second century, and the Peschito, according to the prevalent opinion of scholars, did not appear till quite towards its close. Indeed, it is very unlikely the Peschito should be of an earlier date, since it implies the existence of our canon; and though the books admitted into that canon, must of course have

† "Ἐκ τε τοῦ καθ' Ἐβραίους ἑναγγέλιον καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ, καὶ *iδίως* ἐκ τῆς Ἐβραϊδός διαλέκτου τινὰ τιθησιν, ἐμφαίνων ἐξ Ἐβραίων ἐαντὸν πεπιευκέναι· καὶ ἀλλὰ δὲ ὡς ἀν ἐξ Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἀγράφου παραδόσεως μνημονεύει.

existed much earlier, yet we discern no traces of anything like a canonical recognition of them till we come to the writings of Irenæus and Tertullian in the latter part of the second century. The old Latin canon, discovered by Muratori, belongs probably to the opening of the third. The question, then, occurs again, What was the Syriac Gospel used by Hegesippus? I ask for information. Was there an early commencement of a Syriac version, before the appearance of the completer work of the Peschito? The existence of a numerous body of converts at Antioch, even in the apostolic age, would seem to render the production of such a Gospel as necessary for the use of Syrians, as that of the Aramæan Gospel of the Hebrews for the Palestinian Christians, and that of Matthew or Mark (whichever we suppose to be the older) in Greek for the Hellenists and the heathens. As the want was pressing, the work would probably begin before the whole number of our present canonical books was completed, and be continued progressively as new books were approved and recognized by the Church. From the association of the Syriac Gospel with that of the Hebrews among the sources used by Hegesippus, we may perhaps infer that it was a Syriac rendering, with some additions peculiar to itself, of the original Aramæan collection of our Lord's discourses made by Matthew. It could not have been widely at variance with the Hebrew Gospel, or it would not have been employed by Hegesippus. Possibly it might stand to that Hebrew, or rather Aramæan, original (*ipsum Hebraicum, Matthæi authenticum*, in the language of Jerome) in somewhat the same relation as our present Greek Matthew; that is to say, it might be not a simple version, but the adoption of a primitive nucleus incorporated with materials from other sources. Few renderings of earlier materials were in that age mere translations. Though closely allied to the Gospel of the Hebrews, this Syriac Gospel must still have been different from it; otherwise it would not have been mentioned as a distinct source used by Hegesippus. These preliminary labours would not be overlooked by subsequent translators, as the Syriac version of the New Testament Scriptures continually widened its limits to take in new books; earlier translations being constantly corrected and modified, to bring them into more exact agreement with the recognized standard of the Catholic Church; till the Peschito, which represented the canon of Irenæus and Tertullian, of Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, and which we learn from Ephrem Syrus enjoyed full ecclesiastical authority at Edessa in the first half of the fourth century (De Wette, Einleit. N. T. § 11 c.), superseded all earlier versions, and caused them to go out of use and be forgotten. It is undeniable, that the recognition of a scriptural canon by the Catholic Church at the end of the second century, had a great effect on the use of a previous Christian literature. We have an example in the well-known story of

Theodoret of Cyrus, who found the Diatessaron of Tatian (a fourfold evangelical narrative, which we must suppose had some affinity with our present four Gospels) in general use among the inhabitants of his diocese in the latter part of the fourth century, but withdrew it from circulation by his own authority, and replaced it by our canonical Scriptures. Although, therefore, the Syriac Gospel, used by Hegesippus, could not have been the Peschito, is there anything unreasonable in the supposition, that it prepared the way for it, and formed one in a series of versions which the Peschito itself made use of, and at length, with various corrections and modifications, incorporated in its own more perfect work? The supposition is favoured by analogies in the history of other translations. An old Latin version, commenced as early as the second century—at least with certain books of the New Testament—and probably, in north-western Africa—re-touched, revised, interpolated through successive generations, prepared the way for the labours of Jerome, and appears to form at this day the basis of the Vulgate.* In our own country the course of our English versions has very much resembled that which preceded the adoption of the Vulgate in the Latin Church; successive scholars assumed and improved upon the work of their predecessors; so that the early labours of Tyndale, Coverdale and Rogers, not without considerable assistance from the Geneva translation, constitute the basis on which our present Authorized Version rests.

It is understood, that among the Syriac treasures which have been recovered from the Nitrian monasteries of Egypt, and some of which have been given to the world by Mr. Cureton, there exist fragments of a version of the New Testament, which exhibits a text differing considerably from that of the Peschito, and from any other yet known and used by scholars. The publication of these fragments might possibly throw some light on the subject of the present paper, and would certainly possess great interest. Whatever might appear on examination to be their character and probable date, no consideration for the sensitive prejudices of orthodoxy should be allowed to prevent an unreserved communication to the world of any documents calculated to illustrate the history and early condition of a text, on which so many questions are yet depending, as that of the New Testament.

J. J. T.

* I gather this to be the opinion of Lachmann, from some passages in the preface to his Greek Testament. “*Alii posthac subtilius exponent quot numero interpres fuerint et quo ordine scripserint: mihi satis est si de maiore parte Novi Testamenti demonstravero, singulos libros semel Latinis verbis expressos esse, deinde inmutatos ab aliis, non denuo versos.*” P. xi. Again, in another passage, p. xix, he describes the various Latin codices, as “*veteres Africanos, emendatos Italicos, privatim interpolatos—vulgatos Hieronymianos.*”

UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY.

Edinburgh, December 12, 1856.

MY DEAR SIR,

I AM sure I shall meet with the concurrence of your readers when I express my thanks to Mr. Tayler for opening the important question on which he gave his own views in the last number of the Christian Reformer. I am anxious for the thorough discussion of that question, and I therefore take the earliest opportunity of contributing a few thoughts toward the work.

The question, as I understand it, is—By what remedial means Unitarian churches may be brought to a state of greater efficiency.

Mr. Tayler's remarks so far obtain the assent of my judgment, and are written in a spirit of which my heart so entirely approves, that I should be exceedingly sorry if anything I may say were to be regarded in an antagonistic light. Great as is the agreement between his opinions and mine, of which I am already conscious, I am persuaded it would be still greater if one or two points of his exposition were made clearer to my mind than they at present are; and where I differ from him, I desire to state my difference with the caution which a possible misapprehension of his meaning should produce.

I entirely sympathize with his general statement as to the evils and deficiencies prevailing among us; and I, with him, cannot consider the external disadvantages under which we labour, and the want of ecclesiastical organization in our body, as sufficient to account for the condition of things needing to be improved. It is a spiritual change which can alone effect the improvement; and under the influence of that change we should be able to withstand better than we now do the opposition to which we might be exposed, and should naturally bring into operation every method of united action which the wants of our case might demand. Standing with Mr. Tayler, therefore, on this common ground, I can start fairly by his side in the investigation of the true character of that spiritual remedy which we both agree is the kind of remedy to be sought for.

I may as well state, at the outset, what is my own view of the remedy required. Mine is a very simple remedy indeed,—one which evidently lies within our power to adopt, and to the nature of which no objection can be entertained. It consists in the renewed fidelity to their professed religious principles which should distinguish the individual members of our churches. I desire no change in the constitution of those churches, but I desire a change in the character and conduct of the persons composing them. The evils complained of are personal, and the remedy must be personal also. Without a personal disposition and effort toward the work to be done, no machinery which

could be furnished, let it embrace the enforcement of whatever doctrines it may, will accomplish that work; and such disposition and effort would supersede the necessity of any reconstruction of machinery, by immediately doing all that was required to be done. We want that those who profess our principles should really prove their interest in and live up to their profession; and while that want remains, it is useless to look out for other principles which may serve our turn better than those we hold. What hope can there be that some new expedient which is offered to our faith will regenerate us, if we are lacking in activity and zeal with regard to the matters with which our faith is at present concerned? Why need we blame our circumstances as presenting too few topics of mutual excitement and sympathy, when the topics acknowledged by us are not made available for the excitement and sympathy natural to their character? It is the call of duty as to what has been placed under our control that we have first to attend to, and while we are longing for other spheres of duty which have not been assigned to us, we shall only strengthen our reluctance to obey that call.

It is scarcely necessary that I should do more in vindication of the remedy I am suggesting than bring it face to face with the statement of failure and deficiency which Mr. Tayler has drawn up. "What fruits," says he, "do we produce, what influence do we exert, at all proportioned to the breadth of our principles, the opportunities of our position, and the wide-spread sympathy with many of our prominent views, which is known to exist in the world? Why is this sympathy not called out into more active expression, and made to react more powerfully on the spiritual condition of society?" I answer, Because our principles are not carried into living action as they might and should be, because our opportunities are not employed with the faithfulness and energy which they demand, and because the sympathy with our views existing in the world is not met on our part by corresponding exercises of attachment to those views. "Why is it," he proceeds, "that, with very few exceptions, the state of learning, and especially of theological learning, has fallen so low amongst us?—that mere *belles-lettres* accomplishment has so generally superseded scholarship? So that we occupy relatively a much lower position in the learned world than our ancestors a century ago, and, as compared with the great body of the Protestant clergy on the continent, especially in Germany, are sadly in the rear of the actual state of ascertained knowledge." I answer, Because scholarship, and especially theological scholarship, does not possess among our people the interest which it formerly possessed. An indifference to its results has so far grown up in our body, that learning constitutes no qualification for ministerial success, and the most careful preparation for the work of the ministry affords no security for

obtaining congregational favour. "Why is there," he further asks, "so general a complaint of the languid condition of our institutions? Why are so many things started among us, which come to no effect? Why are our meetings so often aimless and profitless?" I answer, Because our institutions are not supported by the presence and assistance of our members as they ought to be; because so little sympathy is extended to measures for increased benefit, that it is almost impossible to secure unanimity toward anything which is started to that end; and because the heart and soul of our societies is not thrown into the business for which our meetings are constituted. The whole case thus resolves itself, in my mind, into one which, according to the particular nature of the subject, requires a better spirit—a spirit of deeper concern and more earnest exertion—to be infused into those who have the interest of Unitarianism in charge. This can only be done by individual efforts of reformation and resolve. The mere putting of the case as Mr. Tayler has put it, seems to me directly to bear upon the point on which I am insisting, and his language, when he comes to enforce his own remedy, insensibly takes that form which the strictly personal nature of the case demands. Thus he says:

"The first step is to revive and develop a deeper and more earnest religious life." "Life in the whole can only grow out of life in the several parts. Juxtaposition of dead members, however artificially contrived, will not produce a living organism." "The condition of any successful result is, before all things, . . . the development of a distinct religious consciousness. This alone can give vitality, harmony and effect to any common deliberations."

Mr. Tayler does not use these expressions exactly in the sense for the sake of which I have quoted them, and in making my quotations I have omitted what does not immediately concern my purpose; but, in justice to him as well as to myself, I have thought it right thus emphatically to mark sentiments which coincide so nearly with my own.

Having stated my remedy, I proceed to state the one Mr. Tayler has proposed. It is this: that our churches should be reconstructed on a doctrinal basis which recognizes the life of Christ as the expression of the religion they cultivate. I will quote from his letter a few sentences in which this position is laid down.

"My conviction is, that our spiritual, and therefore our social, weakness as a body, results from the want of our common recognition of some definite, positive belief, as a vital centre of our manifold intellectual and sentimental divergencies." "What we are in search of is some central conviction which expresses the essence of Christianity, and yet is capable of being approached, apprehended and realized under various forms of intellectual conception, corresponding to the wants and capacities of various religious temperaments." "The question is, not what should be the rule of brotherly action towards all men, believers and unbelievers,

Christians and simple Theists; but what should be the bond of sympathy and joint action in a community professedly Christian? This I can find in nothing broader, and at the same time more positive, than the acceptance of the life of Christ as the type of our own." "In the simple acceptance of Jesus Christ as the type of human religiousness, as a revelation of the spiritual worth and destiny of man, and the endeavour, through believing sympathy with it, to transform and glorify our own life by its power of self-sacrificing love,—I find the true point of union for a Christian church, the central principle and aim which makes it properly Christian."

This doctrinal union Mr. Tayler distinguishes from the present constitution of Unitarian churches in the following passage, the object of which is to point out the inefficiency of our existing arrangements:

"Free inquiry is far too weak and negative a principle. In fact, free inquiry is not a principle at all, properly so called. It is a condition of mental action, not a principle. It supposes some positive matter already extant, to which it can be applied. It is a condition of development; but then there must first be something to develop. Now we have overlooked this, or nearly so. We have treated a condition as if it were a principle. It will be answered, Scripture or Christianity is of course implied. But what Scripture? its letter or its spirit? the whole of it or only certain books? and by what test do you discriminate the divine from the simply human? Again: What Christianity? What do you understand by Christianity? In what do you make it consist? It is clear to me, that something more positive is yet required to bind us intelligently and vitally together. Would I then introduce a creed? Certainly not, as a creed is usually understood. But there must be some principle, some fact, recognized in common, as the object of joint sympathy and the motive of joint action, or no body of men could possibly co-exist as a religious association. Where, then, are we to find this principle, this fact? My objection to the term Unitarian is, that it is at once too narrow and too negative. Though indicating a truth, and a very great truth, it still does not express the *essential* element of the *Christian* faith, for we hold it in common with Jews, Mahometans and Theists of every description; and, moreover, it assumes to itself exclusive possession of a truth which all Christians equally claim, simply by repudiating the form in which they are accustomed to realize it. Unfortunately, as it seems to me, it has become the designation of a Christian body, from simple antagonism to the so-called Athanasian symbol, and has thus stamped on their creed a character of reactionary negation."

The conclusion to be drawn from this exposition of his views is, that Mr. Tayler would establish an acceptance of the life of Christ as the binding principle of our Christian associations, in the place of the Scriptures or Christianity as interpreted by free inquiry, and thereby supersede the distinct profession of Unitarianism.

I presume I am right in inferring that when Mr. Tayler proposes an acceptance of the life of Christ "as the bond of sympathy and joint action in a community professedly Christian," he

intends something more than that this principle should stand in the same relation to such a community as it and similar principles now stand toward churches called Unitarian. He must be as conscious as I am that by insisting upon the importance of this principle he is not introducing any novelty among us. He cannot therefore have only in view an enforcement of the principle itself. I hope I do not mistake his intention when I say that I gather from all he has advanced, that he selects this principle from others in order to fix it in a different relation to the constitution of our societies from that in which this constitution at present places any principles with whose interests it is concerned. It is in some way to be so connected with these societies as to characterize them in distinction from everything else. Now I wish to know what exactly is meant by this. What are the precise measures contemplated? What are the specific changes to be effected? I cannot obtain any satisfactory answer to these questions from Mr. Tayler's letter; and till such an answer be obtained, I know not what I should be assenting to if I were to express approval of his plan. It was, I think, but right that the means of satisfaction as to the practical carrying out of his recommendation should have been afforded, because most serious dangers attach to certain ways of its being carried out. I do not myself see how those dangers can be avoided, and I should like to be made acquainted with what is relied upon for avoiding them.

There is, for instance, the danger of a doctrinal test being applied to the members of our churches. How is that danger to be avoided? Are we to make the non-acceptance of the life of Christ a ground of exclusion from our communion? And if not, in what way are we to give to that communion a character answering more decidedly than is now the case to an acceptance of the life of Christ? I am not able to escape from this dilemma; and till some way of escape be shewn to me, I must conclude that Mr. Tayler's proposal points in the direction of that kind of creed bondage which would be destructive of all that is most marked and influential in our position. When Mr. Tayler asks himself the question, "Would I then introduce a creed?" he answers, "Certainly not, as a creed is generally understood;" but I am wishful to know how he would distinguish between what is generally understood and what he would introduce. I do not find the distinction in the succeeding sentence, where he says, "There must be some principle, some fact, recognized in common, as the object of joint sympathy and the motive of joint action, or no body of men could possibly co-exist as a religious association." I fully subscribe to that sentiment, and am prepared to defend the constitution of our churches as consistent with it. There are both principles and facts recognized in common by us; but the recognition does not present the necessity for requiring from our members any other test than that which

their voluntary association implies. More than that appears to me to be "a creed as generally understood," and without this addition, or something equivalent to it, I do not perceive how an acceptance of the life of Christ can be made more expressive of our associations than it at present is.

There is an intimation in Mr. Tayler's letter as to the separation of unbelievers from our religious communion, which, although I do not fully understand its application, seems to look with an unfavourable aspect toward the liberty which we cultivate in that respect. As Mr. Tayler has formerly distinguished himself in the defence of this particular branch of our church freedom, I cannot suspect him of entertaining any purpose of restricting it, but the cast of thought which marks his present reference to the subject is a rather singular indication that he is treading upon dangerous ground. I must also observe, in dismissing this part of my subject, that a similar indication is afforded in the prospect held out by Mr. Tayler of "an annual representation of our whole body in public meeting." I should hope that if the plain reason of the case did not convince us that such a synodical assembly must be dangerous to our theological freedom, the experience of our Independent brethren, under the pressure of their Congregational Union,—with the noise of whose complaints the air is full,—would be a sufficient warning on that subject.

I am a member of a Christian church in which free inquiry is one of the main conditions of the association, and which makes open profession of Unitarianism. Unitarian Christian is therefore the designation I ordinarily adopt. I shall occupy the remainder of this communication with a vindication of the position I thus, in common with Christians of my class, assume, viewing it in the light of Mr. Tayler's remarks.

It is in deference to that reception of Christian truth which commends itself to the individual conviction of the members of our churches that creeds and confessions of faith are rejected by them. None of those members would, I should suppose, object to identify this conviction with the life of Christ. This at least is one of the main forms in which a Christian belief is universally represented among us. That belief would be, and is, declared in this form under fitting circumstances, just as, under other circumstances, it may be declared in the forms of adherence to the Scriptures or acceptance of Christianity. To these latter forms Mr. Tayler objects, by asking, "What Scripture? its letter or its spirit?" and "What Christianity? What do you understand by Christianity?" But Mr. Tayler must be well aware that exactly similar questions may be urged against the form he recommends. It may and will be asked, What life of Christ? His natural or his miraculous life? The letter or the spirit of his life? His life as God, or man, or both? These questions are as pertinent to the case he advocates, as those advanced by

himself are to the cases he disparages; and provided the free constitution of our churches be not interfered with, nothing is or can be gained by the substitution pleaded for. Especially is this true when the form recommended is already in constant use for the purpose indicated, and may, without change of arrangement, be practically employed to any conceivable extent. Mr. Tayler thus expounds his own principle, in consistency with this view of the matter:

"A centre like this admits of the friendly association of very wide diversities of doctrinal belief in the same religious communion. Accepting with equal reverence the life of Christ as a mediation between God and man, different parties, according to their different spiritual wants, as the practical or the mystical element of religion is most predominant in their minds, may dwell more on the human or on the divine side of that life, trace out its ethical relations with mankind, or speculate on the high possibilities of its transcendental connection with Deity, without thereby dissolving their Christian fellowship. The friendly co-existence of these opposite tendencies within the same religious society would even be beneficial to both by mutual self-restraint and the retention of each within due limits. Leaving untouched the great fact of Christ's divine life, this bond of union would allow the greatest freedom of judgment on the details of his history, and on the criticism and interpretation of the books which record it, without exposing sensitive minds to the continual dread of disturbing fundamentals."

In these sentences Mr. Tayler plainly gives up any superiority as to distinctness and positiveness which his principle might have been supposed to have. He leaves it in these respects not only on a level with that from which he would distinguish it, but in the same position it now sustains toward the religious interest he desires to connect it with.

The vagueness of statement as to the Christian basis of our religious associations which is brought out by the questions—What is Scripture? What is Christianity? What is Christ?—does not, I confess, at all trouble me. I am persuaded it could be productive of no evil, if the personal responsibility which relates to such questions was fulfilled. Were it the case that those associated on these general terms could individually reply that Scripture, Christianity and Christ, stood toward them in a definite form embraced by their independent faith, a far better result, in its bearing upon united action, would be produced, than could be produced by any sharper definition of the common standard of faith. Mr. Tayler has observed, that "Free inquiry is not a principle at all, properly so called. It is a condition of mental action." It should be added to this, however, that free inquiry is that condition of mental action which preserves the true relation of Christianity to the human mind. It enables the man who exercises it to connect himself with Christianity on its own proper merits without the bias of authority or prejudice, and thus gives to the truth he holds a clearer Christian character

and a higher Christian sanction. To such a Christianity as this no charge of vagueness can be justly applied. Within its own circle of operation, it will be as precise as thought can make it; and when suffered to prevail throughout a community, it will accomplish all the purposes of Christian life and influence by virtue of the power supplied by its freedom as well as of that inherent in its truth. Those who profess it cannot hope to rival orthodox churches in the influence supplied by that theological organization on which orthodoxy prides itself, but the quality may be set against the quantity of their success. It should be kept in mind, in all our speculations upon the condition of bodies which cultivate the kind of Christianity under notice, that there are methods of popular effect, on which the reliance of other Christian bodies is chiefly placed, that they cannot employ. Much unnecessary complaint might be prevented by this remembrance.

So much for the Christian part of the position I maintain. Let me now turn to its identification with Unitarianism.

The question whether or not we should call ourselves by the Unitarian as well as the Christian name, is not a question left for our own decision, if we mean to practise simple honesty in the expression of the opinions we really hold. The exemplification of such honesty will fix upon us this name quite irrespective of our choice. Trinitarians will distinguish themselves from us on our openly declaring what our views on the Trinitarian controversy are; and whether we like it or not, we must submit to a separation which necessarily involves our being called Unitarians as the most appropriate designation we can obtain. It will indeed be generally conceded to us as a favour, by reason of our objecting to other names of an offensive character which come more naturally to hand. There are very few of our churches that have voluntarily taken this name as expressive of the principle of their religious association, and it is not, in fact, truly expressive of the principle on which the great body of those churches were constituted. As they became actually Unitarian, however, and plainly declared their Unitarian belief, they were forced, by the exclusion which orthodoxy practises beyond the line of that belief, to submit to a more marked identification with Unitarianism than their views of the abstract propriety of the case contemplated. This they could not avoid, except by denying or concealing their real faith; nor will they be able to avoid it in consistency with fidelity to themselves, as long as orthodoxy adheres to its present claims.

I may, in illustration of what I have just said, take up an instance which Mr. Tayler himself introduces for a dissimilar purpose. I do not think he does justice to Dr. Priestley and his school when he represents them as desirous of departing from the unsectarian basis of English Presbyterianism. His statement on this head is as follows:

"Dr. Priestley's followers were for substituting a sharply-defined Unitarianism for the vague doctrinal system in which they found most of the Presbyterian churches. But a still later generation, sympathizing with the greater breadth of Dr. Channing's theology, felt that the adoption of any specific dogma, especially one cast in so narrow a mould, and infected by so questionable a religious philosophy, as the English Unitarianism of the end of the last century, involved sectarianism, and was an infringement of the broad catholic principle on which the churches of their ancestors had been based."

I am not aware that Dr. Priestley and his followers contemplated more than a clear and consistent utterance of the theological convictions they entertained, and I am sure Dr. Channing and his followers worked toward the same result. It would be easy to shew that the former party were as deeply attached to "the broad catholic principle on which the churches of their ancestors had been based," as the latter party were. It was the unwavering honesty of Dr. Priestley and his followers to the obligations of what commended itself to them as Christian truth, which alone placed them before the world as acknowledged Unitarians; and the same honesty has stamped the character of Unitarians no less decidedly upon Dr. Channing and his followers. This effect always must occur in connection with similar honesty, and its occurrence implies no violation of the broadest catholic principle as constituting the basis of church association.

A record of personal experience may set this matter forth more distinctly than any reasoning can do. Ever since my connection with Unitarianism, I have been strongly impressed with the consideration that Christianity, as distinguished from Unitarianism, is and ought to be practically treated as the true foundation of our church union. I have, acting under this impression, frequently refused to employ the Unitarian name beyond the bounds of the controversy to which it properly belongs. There are many circumstances under which I should still persist in that refusal. I have, however, been so situated, over and over again, that my refusal to make use of this name, when its appropriateness was doubtful to my own mind, subjected me to a charge of cowardice or insincerity. In such cases I have not hesitated to throw off the moral imputation, at the risk of some want of correctness in defining my religious position. The consequence is, that there are now instances in which, for the honour of my own character, I adopt the name of Unitarian where I should have shrunk from adopting it at the beginning of my course. Experience has taught me, what it must teach every one in my situation, that as to taking or refusing this name we are not our own masters, if we determine to preserve that godly simplicity which answers to our actual belief.

Is it right to cultivate this simplicity in favour of Unitarianism? That is the true question to be considered. And how a

man professing Christianity at all, can give other than an affirmative answer to that question, is strange indeed to me. It is strange how such a man should presume to decide which among the Christian truths he holds, is unworthy of his open confession. The very idea of such a decision applied to any part of Christianity, is inconsistent with the nature of the truth on which it is brought to bear. The moral claims which all truth has upon the action of those who believe it, are irrespective of any calculation of consequences, and to descend to this calculation is to step out of the region of conscience. But here we are saved from the occasion of calculation by the relative importance of Unitarianism being pressed upon us, in the very circumstances which call for our action in its favour. The orthodoxy which so insists upon the broad distinction between Trinitarian and Unitarian views as to fix Unitarianism in a position of decided separation which no honest effort of its adherents can overcome, has thus declared in the strongest possible terms its sense of the importance of the truth on this subject. The declaration answers to the necessity of the case. What is manifested in fact has its root in principle. Though we may think that this root is watered by prejudice so as to gain an unnatural expansion, we are bound to take up the question of difference between ourselves and others as it is really presented to us, and to cultivate the fidelity which is imposed upon us in that form. We cannot otherwise discharge our duty either to God or to man.

The circumstance that so many shelter themselves under an orthodox profession, although their real opinions and feelings are alienated from the system under which they seek refuge, ought, instead of producing a relaxation of effort, as it often does, to stimulate to a more vigorous discharge of the duty devolving upon us. While the opposite profession remains, the truth we hold suffers by the compromise attempted. The attempt restrains that truth from being clearly exhibited and efficiently applied; and it is incumbent upon us to state and defend it in exposure of the spirit of false accommodation as well as in resistance to the enforcement of unqualified error.

No one who seriously considers the subject need doubt that it is the known and felt importance of the Unitarian controversy, and not a persuasion of its insignificance, which gives rise to the evident reluctance to make open confession of Unitarian belief. That controversy is so important, that to rank ourselves on the Unitarian side of it is to forfeit Christian countenance and respect to an incalculable degree. Therefore men, in opposition to the plain result of their own convictions, persist in repudiating the name. Therefore they prefer dark and doubtful indications of those convictions to an open exposition of the truth concerning themselves. They will not face the odium which openness of speech and conduct would bring upon them.

To persons of the class last alluded to, I do not address myself; but to those of us who have been hitherto distinguished by the profession of Unitarianism, I say, that the evils and disadvantages which that profession entails upon us are as nothing in comparison with the honourable status it wins for us. On the whole question of religious truth with which our Unitarianism is identified, we are "the salt of the earth," and "as a city set upon a hill." Sad, indeed, would it be for the religious interests of our country, if we were to renounce our distinctive profession on account of any pain and difficulty connected with it. That pain and difficulty are our appointed lot, as much as any other particulars of our position; and if, as is the case, this position is one of restricted influence compared with that of the religious sects and parties around us, it is so by virtue of the stricter and more self-denying responsibility to which we have been called and found faithful.

What can be more important in the whole circle of religious truth than the views we entertain with regard to the nature of God, and the moral principles which regulate human salvation? What can be more obligatory in connection with religious duty than the rendering of sole allegiance to Him whom we believe to be the only Object of worship? Much of Mr. Tayler's objection to the Unitarian name is founded upon a separation of it from those Christian acknowledgments with which, throughout our churches, it is carefully connected, and to which it gives a distinctive value they could not otherwise possess. The mere term Unitarian *Christian* is a sufficient correction of the most plausible deficiency he points out.

Though much still remains unsaid, I must, perforce, bring this long letter to a close. I shall do so by simply indicating a point which seems to me, above all others, needful to be attended to, in order to the success of the personal remedy for which I have pleaded. It must originate in the cultivation of a more decidedly religious character than prevails among us. To do a religious work we must first be religious men. The temper and habit of our lives must be moulded and directed by religious principle, and all the exercises proper to religion must be practised with that conscientious diligence which springs from a feeling of the supreme value of this highest interest of man. When such a character as this is distinctive of the members of our churches, those churches will rise to a position which will secure for them the influence legitimately due to the truth they hold, and whatever services are prescribed by the necessities of that truth will be fulfilled by these members with the certainty and completeness attendant upon a labour of love.

I am, yours faithfully,

JOHN GORDON.

SIR EDWIN SANDYS.

THE early portion of the 17th century was prolific of great men, who attracted to their character and writings so large a share of attention, that some of their contemporaries of lesser fame have scarcely received the notice to which they are fairly entitled. Sir Edwin Sandys is one of this class. As a patriot in a very critical period of English history, and a sufferer for his patriotism,—as a thinker somewhat in advance of his age, and an eloquent English prose writer,—as the personal friend of Hooker and Selden,—and as an early patron of the Pilgrim Fathers of America,—Edwin Sandys has claims upon respectful attention, which have hitherto been recognized to an extent scarcely adequate to his merits. We propose, in this and another article, to attempt a sketch of his life, gathered from various printed sources of information, and to give some account of a remarkable book which bears his name.

Edwin Sandys was born, it is supposed, in the year 1561, in the city of Worcester. He sprang, according to Strype's language, "from an ancient Gentile family in St. Bees, in Cumberland." His grandfather was a justice of the peace. His father, a somewhat distinguished Prelate of the Church of England, was, when Edwin Sandys was born, Bishop of Worcester, and became afterwards successively Bishop of London and Archbishop of York. He had married as his second wife Cecilia,* daughter of Sir Thomas Wilford, of Cranbrook. (Hasted, in his Kent, designates him Thomas Wilford, Esq.) It may be mentioned as characteristic of the times, that the marriages of Prelates were looked upon by many as scandalous, and were but "winked at" by the Queen herself. During Sandys's occupation of the see of Worcester, a Romanist neighbour, Sir John Bourne, was in the habit of using insulting language respecting the Bishop's wife, and upon one occasion a tumultuous fight arose in consequence between the retainers of Bourne and those of the Bishop, in which several parties were wounded. The issue of Bishop Sandys's second marriage was eight children, of whom five were sons, several of whom distinguished themselves by their public services or by their literary talents. Edwin, the second son, took honourable rank in both departments. Who were the teachers of his early youth we know not. If, as is probable, he resided chiefly in Worcester till his tenth year, when his father was translated to the see of London, he might have been one of the early pupils of the grammar-school founded by the Queen in Worcester the very year of his birth,—a learned and well-

* She was described by a no friendly witness as "fair, well-nurtured, sober and demure."—Strype's Annals Eliz. folio, 349.

endowed establishment, which ranks amongst its alumni* of the next century the great constitutional lawyer and statesman, Lord Somers. We learn from Isaac Walton who the college tutor of Edwin Sandys was, and under what circumstances he became so. Sandys and Jewel had been companions in exile during the Marian persecution. As they had then eaten “the bread of sorrow” together, they afterwards enjoyed the sweets of friendship. A little before Jewel died (1571), the two Bishops met, and Jewel, whose penetration had thus early discovered the rare talents of the future author of “Ecclesiastical Polity,” spoke to his friend in high praise of the learning and morals of Richard Hooker. Sandys was so impressed by what was said, that though he himself was of Cambridge, and Hooker was a member of the sister University, he at once formed a resolution, which he afterwards carried into effect, saying, “I will have a tutor for my son that shall teach him learning by instruction, and virtue by example; and my greatest care shall be of the last; and, God willing, this Richard Hooker shall be the man into whose hands I will commit my Edwin.” Walton adds, that “the Bishop did so about twelve months, or not much longer, after this resolution.” In his chronology good Isaac Walton is a little loose, for he represents Sandys as “not much younger” than Hooker, though in fact there was a difference of eight years,—a serious difference at the time indicated, when the elder was only nineteen.

According to Wood (*Athen. Ox.* II. 472), Sandys was admitted a scholar of Corpus Christi College, Sept. 1577. This was the year of Hooker’s obtaining his Master’s degree, and also a fellowship in that college. Whether Sandys became the pupil of Hooker at the age of eleven or twelve, or four years afterwards, as we are disposed to think, must be left a little uncertain; but there can be no doubt of the great advantages he enjoyed both in his college and his tutor. The former was, in the words of Isaac Walton, “noted for an ancient library, strict students and remarkable scholars.” Established early in the 16th century by Bishops Fox and Oldham, who were in spirit educational reformers, it was the first college in which full provision was made for the cultivation of Greek and Latin. Warton, in his *History of Poetry*, speaks of this “philological establishment” as the first conspicuous instance of an attempt to depart from the narrow plan of education which had hitherto been held sacred in the universities of England. Large and extravagant

* In Carlisle’s Endowed Grammar-schools (Vol. II. p. 777), the author of *Hudibras*, Samuel Butler, is said to have been educated here. But this is an error. He was a pupil of the noted Henry Bright (ancestor of our valued correspondent, Mr. H. A. Bright, who a few days ago graduated B.A. at Cambridge), master, not of the Grammar-school, but of the King’s school, in Worcester, founded in 1542 by Henry VIII.

were the expectations of the learned throughout Europe of the result. Erasmus uttered a prediction, which time has not confirmed, that what the Colossus was to Rhodes, what the Mausoleum was to Caria, that Corpus Christi College would be to Britain. During Mary's reign, Corpus Christi College proved, as Jewel found to his cost, the stronghold of Popery, and from its secret treasury it produced altar ornaments, abolished in the previous reign, sufficient to stock all the churches of Oxford. Much of this might be attributed to the zeal for the old religion of Dr. Cheadsey, its President, the chaplain and the personal friend of Bonner. His office was filled in Sandys's day by Dr. William Cole, one of the Marian exiles at Geneva. Under his influence, the college would soon lose its Popish taint. When Sandys entered Corpus Christi College, its President was also Vice-chancellor of the University, and Henry Saville, afterwards Provost of Eton, and who founded the Oxford Professorships which bear his name, was one of the Proctors.

In Richard Hooker, Sandys found not only a learned and skilful tutor, but a life's friend. These were the qualities ascribed to him as an University tutor: "He had made the subtlety of all the arts easy and familiar to him, and useful for the discovery of such learning as lay hid from common searchers. So that by these, added to his great reason, and his restless industry added to both, he did not only know more of causes and effects; but what he knew, he knew better than other men. And with this knowledge he had a most blessed and clear method of demonstrating what he knew, to the great advantage of all his pupils." That such a tutor became their friend, will be readily believed by those who, after perusing Isaac Walton's matchless portraiture of the man, realize his simplicity of character, his gentle temper never ruffled by passion, his genial manner, and his pure, unselfish soul. The eulogium which the biographer passes on the friendship which grew up between Hooker and his pupil Sandys, has almost the solemn beauty of a passage of holy writ. Their friendship was "made up of religious principles, which increased daily by a similitude of inclinations to the same recreations and studies; a friendship elemented in youth and in an university, free from self ends, which the friendships of age usually are not. And in this sweet, this blessed, this spiritual amity, they went on for many years; and as the holy Prophet saith, *so they took sweet counsel together, and walked in the house of God as friends.*"

Another life friendship which Sandys formed at Oxford was with his fellow-pupil, George Cranmer, the great-nephew of the Archbishop. He is described by Camden as "a gentleman of singular hopes;" and the papers he left behind him, some of which are now in print, shew him to have been wise, learned and religious.

With such a companion when worshiping at St. Mary's, where on the day of his execution the Archbishop confessed and bewailed his previous timidity and insincerity,—or, when walking near Balliol College, they came to the spot where, one-and-twenty years before, many then living had seen the murderous flames lit in which the martyr purged his previous inconsistencies,—we may well conceive how strongly both the youths would learn to abhor the crimes growing out of religious persecution. It was certainly a remarkable circumstance that George Cranmer should be entered a scholar of that college whose former President persecuted to the death the three Oxford martyrs, of whom Cranmer was, if the least worthy, certainly not the least gifted.

If Edwin Sandys had received from his father the Calvinistic opinions which generally characterized the Marian exiles, it is probable they were early in his life modified by the sentiments of his tutor, whose gentle and loving nature would not endure the stern dogmas of the religious dictator of Geneva. But the influences of both his father and tutor would conspire with the memories then painfully fresh in Oxford to make him averse to the religion of Rome, and to lead him in the direction of those principles of religious liberty, even yet scarcely understood in their wide extent, of which he obtained glimpses not seen by many of his contemporaries.

Edwin Sandys took his first University degree in 1579, but did not proceed to his Master's degree till June in 1583. It is a somewhat unaccountable circumstance, considering his talents, position and influence in the University, that in 1589 he unsuccessfully sought from the University the degree of Bachelor of Law. Whether there was an irregularity in his application, or whether the use made by his father of episcopal patronage had then roused up hostility against the members of his family, we will not hazard a decision. In 1576, the Archbishop was translated to York. A few years after, we find him bestowing a Prebendal stall in the church of York on his son Edwin. This seems strange, when we recollect that Edwin Sandys was not at that time, nor ever was, in holy orders. To strange uses was Church patronage put in those days. Many Church livings were in Elizabeth's reign held by laymen. The plea for this abuse was, that there were not sufficient Protestant ecclesiastics to occupy all the livings. In the time of Edward VI., Latimer made it matter of complaint in the dedication of his Sermons, that spiritual livings were swallowed up by secular persons as a provision for their houses, and that they "hired a Sir John" (an ignorant man in holy orders), "who has better skill in playing at tables or in keeping of a garden, and he for a trifile does serve the cure." Percival Wyburn, somewhat later, complains that boys and others not in holy orders were in the possession of benefices. Even in the reign of James I. we find the Deanery

of Durham held by Adam Newton, who was not in orders, and he continued to receive the profits of the office until his creation as a Baronet in 1620. That abuses of this kind were common, may palliate but cannot justify Archbishop Sandys's employment of his Church patronage to enrich his family. He was by profession a Church reformer, and he could use high language, even against the Crown itself, of his duty to defend his Church from spoliation. On his tomb at Southwell, amongst other commendations, there is this: "*Ecclesiae patrimonium, velut rem Deo consecratam decuit, intactum defendit.*" Later investigations, especially those so ably carried on by the Rev. Joseph Hunter, in the elucidation of the history of Scrooby, have proved that this statement has no more truth than is proverbially assigned to epitaphs.

In 1586, we find the Archbishop thus writing to the Lord Treasurer Burleigh: "My Lord, I have a son at Oxford, a Master of Arts of three or four years' standing, and the Dean (of York) himself will confess that he is well learned, and hath been a student in the law, as I take it, now two years, and will in one year following be fit to proceed Doctor. I must confess that, having nothing else to leave him, I was content to bestow this (the patent for the Chancellorship of the diocese of York) upon him; and drawn thereunto by my learned and wise friends. It was he who made report unto your Lordship of Sir Robert Stapleton's frivolous submission. Your Lordship then liked well of him. And since he hath profited in learning with the best. He is almost twenty-five years of age, and a great deal elder in discretion, sobriety and learning."

A little before this time, the two friends at Corpus Christi had lost the company of their good tutor. In an evil hour he had been persuaded to marry, and "by this marriage the good man was drawn from the tranquillity of his college, from that garden of piety, of pleasure, of peace, and a sweet conversation, into the thorny wilderness of a busy world; into those corroding cares that attend a married priest and a country parsonage, which was Drayton Beauchamp, in Buckinghamshire." Anthony Wood bluntly describes Hooker's wife as "a clownish, silly wife, and withal a mere Xantippe." Walton gives us a picturesque account of a visit paid about a year after his marriage to the parsonage of Drayton Beauchamp: "His two pupils, Edwin Sandys and George Cranmer, took a journey to see their tutor, where they found him with a book in his hand,—it was the Odes of Horace,—he being then, like humble and innocent Abel, tending his small allotment of sheep in a common field, which, he told his pupils, he was forced to do then, for that his servant was gone home to dine, and assist his wife to do some necessary household business. But when his servant returned and released him, then his two pupils attended him into his house, where their best en-

ertainment was his quiet company, which was presently denied them, *for Richard was called to rock the cradle*; and the rest of their welcome was but so like this, that they staid till but next morning, which was time enough to discover and pity their tutor's condition; and they having in that time rejoiced in the remembrance, and then paraphrased on many of the innocent recreations of their younger days, and other like diversions, and thereby given him as much present comfort as they were able, they were forced to leave him to the company of his wife Joan, and seek themselves a quieter lodging for next night. But at their parting from him, Mr. Cranmer said, *Good Tutor, I am sorry your lot is fallen in no better ground as to your parsonage; and more sorry that your wife proves not a more comfortable companion after you have wearied yourself in your restless studies.* To whom the good man replied, *My dear George, if saints have usually a double share in the miseries of this life, I that am none ought not to repine at what my wise Creator hath appointed for me; but labour, as indeed I do daily, to submit mine to his will, and possess my soul in patience and peace.*" (Life of Hooker, Mayor's edit., pp. 187, 188.)

The visit to Drayton Beauchamp was followed by a result of some significant effects on English literature. Edwin Sandys importuned his father, the Archbishop, to provide for this learned and able man some preferment more adequate to his merits, and in which he might do something for the good of the Church and the world. Soon after, Archbishop Sandys had the opportunity of naming him to the Benchers of the Society of the Temple, and with such commendation of his saint-like life and his great merits, that they presently elected him to the office, happily then vacant, of Master of the Temple. It was during his Mastership that Hooker planned and began to execute his great work on "*The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*,"—a work of which the portions duly finished by the author are regarded by competent judges as among the masterpieces of English prose writing, and the whole of which, however we dissent from some of its conclusions, is a creditable specimen of calm and candid reasoning, and the entire absence of the faults which commonly disfigure theological and ecclesiastical controversies. Fond as Churchmen are of appealing to the Law of Ecclesiastical Polity as a successful defence of their principles, it is directly opposed to the pretensions of those ecclesiastics who would elevate the Church above the State. It is throughout essentially Erastian. It also enunciates some democratic principles with great force, and, as Mr. Hallam has shewn, there is no small agreement between Hooker and a writer whom Churchmen do not equally love, John Locke. With the composition and publication of this remarkable work, both Sandys and Cranmer are, however, connected still more directly. To them Hooker submitted his MSS., and from them

he received criticisms and suggestions of no small value. In the recent Oxford edition of Hooker, edited with rare ability by Mr. Keble, specimens of their criticisms are printed (Vol. III. pp. 130—139), which shew them competent in their judgment and sincere in their utterance of it. Mr. Keble makes this remark : “ This document would have been worthy of preservation, were it only for the good sense and accurate reasoning by which, even in such disjointed fragments, the writers have contrived to throw light on many parts of a curious and important subject [that of lay eldership] ; or again as a pleasing monument of the entire affectionate confidence which subsisted between Hooker and his two pupils, occupied as they were in lines of life very far removed from his.” There is, too, a very curious piece of secret literary history connected with that which professes to be Book vi. of “The Ecclesiastical Polity.” By carefully comparing that Book with the criticisms of the two friends upon this part of Hooker’s work, Mr. Keble has shewn to demonstration that that which has been hitherto printed as Book vi., although it may be a genuine composition of Hooker’s, is not what Sandys and Cranmer had submitted to them for their criticism. It was a posthumous publication, and was put together from a mass of confused MSS., which had passed through several hands before they reached those of their first editor, and with many the supposition has found acceptance that Hooker’s papers were wilfully tampered with by some person to whom his unworthy widow gave access to them.

Before parting with Richard Hooker, mention must be made of another important service which Edwin Sandys was able towards the close of his life to render him. The living to which he finally retired was Bourne, in Kent. Here he had some opponents of a malignant and unscrupulous caste, who contrived to entangle him in circumstances that wore a suspicious aspect, and then charged him with immorality, a slander which in the age of Isaac Walton was called “ trepanning.” For months he bore, and with a heavy heart, the foul accusation. But “ the Protector of the innocent” gave him the opportunity of revealing his secret sorrow to his old pupils. They investigated the circumstances, and Edwin Sandys (whose father had once passed through a similar painful ordeal) forced, by his acuteness and perseverance, the opponents of the good pastor to acknowledge his innocence and their own fraud. When they reported to him the detection and confession of his accusers, he said, “ *The Lord forgive them, and the Lord bless you for this comfortable news.*” Not long after, as will be mentioned presently, their beloved tutor was removed to that state where *the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest.*

It was in the memorable year of 1588 that Archbishop Sandys died. He had amply provided for his family (as Mr. Hunter has

shewn in his Historical Collection respecting the Founders of New Plymouth, p. 22) by granting them leases of episcopal lands. Twenty-one of these (which if they resembled Scrooby were perpetual alienations) were distributed amongst his sons, and four of them fell to the share of Edwin. He was by his father's will appointed, in case of his mother's second marriage, guardian of his younger brothers during their minority. Of these, George, the youngest, afterwards attained to equal celebrity as a traveller and as a sacred poet. Of him, a careful memoir has been given to the world by Rev. J. H. Todd, in the Preface to "Selections from the Metrical Paraphrases of the Psalms," &c.

Samuel, the elder brother of Edwin, became a knight, served frequently in Parliament, and left descendants, some of whom in later times attained baronial honours; and Ombersley, in Worcestershire, left to Samuel by the Archbishop, is still the seat of the family, in whose behalf the barony has been recently revived. Church spoliation does not always provoke those family judgments which ecclesiastical partizans love to describe where they fancy they can trace them.

The early passages of the public life of Edwin Sandys gave little promise of what he afterwards proved himself. An intruder on ecclesiastical offices, the duties of which he neither attempted nor was qualified to discharge—a courtier, and one on whom two successive monarchs deigned to smile with favour—the son of an ecclesiastical peer (a class of persons not commonly imbued with popular sympathies)—these scarcely seemed the elements out of which to make a constitutional legislator, steadily devoting himself to retrench the excessive prerogatives of the crown, and to extend the liberty of the subject.

In what year he entered Parliament we cannot with certainty pronounce. On consulting the imperfect lists of the House of Commons, given by Willis in his *Notitia Parliamentaria*, we find that in the sixth Parliament of Elizabeth, elected in 1586, "Edwin Sandes, Esq., " sat for Andover, and that in the two following Parliaments, elected respectively in 1588 and 1592, a gentleman similarly described sat for Plympton. The variation in the spelling of the name is no difficulty. Literary exactness was not the characteristic of even the lettered class in the sixteenth century.

Before the close of Elizabeth's long and prosperous reign, Sandys became one of the officers of her Court. The office which he held was a subordinate one, viz., one of the Esquires of her Body, perhaps equivalent to the modern post of a Lord or Gentleman in Waiting. Somewhere about the year 1596, he set out on an extensive tour through Europe, accompanied throughout by his companion at Corpus Christi and his beloved friend, George Cranmer. Whether he had a political mission to fulfil during the whole or any portion of his residence abroad,

we are not informed. We conjecture that he had ; for we find him very shortly after his return home receiving from the hands of his Sovereign an important gift, viz., the manor of Bishops Em-brook, in Cheriton, in the county of Kent. This princely gift would seem rather the reward of past services than a welcome to an officer newly come to Court. David Loyd, in writing the life of Sir Thomas Smith, in his "Statesmen and Favourites of England," says that in Elizabeth's age it was the policy to main-tain "pregnant students" at the cost of the State, "to be mer-chants for experience in foreign parts ; whence returning home with their gainful adventures, they were preferred according to the improvement of the time to offices in their own country."

Camden, whom Walton follows, mistakenly represents George Cranmer as betaking himself to his travels immediately after quitting the University ; and on his return three years after as finding public employment under the hapless victim of Elizabeth's cruel duplicity, William Davison ; and on his disgrace, accom-panying Sir Henry Killegrew as an attaché of the French em-bassy. But as Davison's disgrace at Court dates from Mary's death in 1587, Cranmer must have entered on public life before that time. The student of history and biography is often com-pelled to distrust the narratives of fascinating writers like Walton and Fuller, the charms of whose style ought not to blind the judgment to their too frequent want of accuracy. Anthony Wood more correctly represents George Cranmer's public em-ployment as anterior to his travels. Looking to all the circum-stances, we think it probable that they were both engaged in the public service before they went abroad, and that they were dur-ing at least a portion of their residence in foreign courts still discharging public duties.

The friends travelled for about three years. Wood specifies France, Germany and Italy, but adds, there were other countries which they visited. It is not improbable that their travels included Spain to the west, and extended to Turkey in the east ; for in speaking of the Greek Church, Sandys refers, though somewhat indistinctly, to "speech and conference" with members of that Church under the "Turkish tyranny." Italy naturally occupied much of their attention, as being the metropolis of that faith which was struggling to reduce the world under its iron grasp. At Venice it was their privilege to hold much confidential inter-course with that accomplished scholar and bold statesman, Father Paul Sarpi.* In addition to their admiration of his wonderful attainments in theology, mathematics, natural philosophy and

* This is clear from what Grotius writes to his brother William (March 18, 1637) : "Sandis, quæ habuit, scripsit ipse, sed ea ex colloquiis viri maximi, Fratris Pauli didicerat." (Grotii Epistolæ, Ep. 395, p. 866, ed. Amstelod., folio, 1687.) Grotius twice mentions Sandys. We shall return to the subject when speaking of the wide and cordial reception of the *Europæ Speculum*.

anatomy, they would converse with a man who “first in modern times and in a Catholic country shook the fabric not only of Papal despotism, but of ecclesiastical independence and power.” (Hallam, History of Literature, III. 41.) In the curious and interesting Life of Sarpi (attributed to his faithful companion, Father Fulgentio), there is a remarkable passage illustrating the frequency of Sarpi’s intercourse with heretical strangers:—“Concerning his communication with heretics, although nothing was proved, yet it took a very great impression on Clement VIII., who remembered it against him a good while after; insomuch that the Father being proposed to the Bishoprick of Nova, although the Pope confessed him to be a man of learning and of great capacity, yet he added that he deserved no preferment from the Church, for the practices that he held with heretics. All which had no other foundation but this, that the city of Venice being so great that it drew from all parts of the world, not only by reason of the business of merchandize, but also such men as have any relish of things that are curious and fit for admiration. And the Father being there at that time in a reputation of one of the most learned men in the world, the professors of sciences, that came not only from Italy, but from other regions, and chiefly the greater personages, that esteemed it a thing worthy of their travel, to see and hold discourse in matter of learning with one that in all professions was not only able to give them satisfaction, but to send them away with wonder; and he, that knew not only terms of humanity and civility, but the most strict canonical rules oblige not to avoid the company of any, except he be by name and individually condemned by the Church,—he without any further scruple thought all sects of strangers worthy of his virtuous conversation.”

The Church of Rome had, however, other reasons for questioning the orthodoxy of Sarpi than his intercourse with ultramontane strangers. One of the charges against him was, that he denied the assistance of the Holy Ghost, and at Mantua the Inquisition interfered with him because he maintained that the doctrine of the Trinity could not be deduced from the first chapter of Genesis. Another charge against him was, that he encouraged Protestants to put forth books to enlighten the people, and that he argued that there was an imminent necessity for a change of religion, for the Popes had become so potent that nothing would satisfy them short of the servitude of all Italy. The dealings which Sarpi held with Sandys, and afterwards with another distinguished Englishman of a kindred spirit, Sir Henry Wotton, certainly afford some evidence of the truth of the latter charge, although the biographer of Sarpi stoutly denies it. To Sandys he not only furnished a large amount of curious information respecting the practices of Italian ecclesias-

tics, but also probably revised and enlarged the notes on this subject taken by his English visitor, and afterwards assisted in the translation into the Italian tongue of his book. Through the influence of Sir Henry Wotton, Sarpi prepared for the use of the King of England his History of the Council of Trent, which was published in London in 1619, was quickly translated into several languages,* and became the text-book of Protestants on this subject.

It will be convenient to reserve for another chapter the account of the volume in which Sandys related the impression made on his mind by his "Survey of the State of Religion in the Western Parts of the World." In the order of time, the publication of that remarkable volume falls in a later period of his life than that at which we have arrived.

The travels of the two friends were brought to a close early in 1599; for in the month of April in that year Sandys dates from Paris the original draft of his book, and in a Preface addressed to Archbishop Whitgift states that he had "finished now almost his intended course of travel, and drawn withall to the expiration of the time prefined thereto."

Cranmer immediately entered the service of Charles Blount, the Earl of Mountjoy (afterwards Earl of Devonshire), a great favourite with the aged Queen, and some time the rival of the Earl of Essex. With him he proceeded in the expedition against the Irish undertaken in the beginning of 1600, and unfortunately fell in an engagement at Carlingford, fought on the 13th day of November. Camden bewails his fall, and describes him as "vir eruditissimus et ipsi eo nomine longe charissimus."†

That same month was fatal also to the other dearest friend Edwin Sandys had, his good tutor, Richard Hooker, who died in his parsonage at Bourne, Nov. 2, 1600, being only forty-six years of age. One of the witnesses of his will was George, the father of Cranmer, who was indeed a kinsman of Hooker.

It is probable that Sir Edwin Sandys married early in life. He led to the altar before his death no less than four wives, and as the fourth wife bore to him an unusually large family, we may naturally conclude that his married life began before he went abroad. As he continued abroad three years, it is probable that at that time he was a widower. His first wife was Margaret, the daughter of John Eveleigh, of Devon. The produce of this marriage was one daughter, Elizabeth, who became the wife

* It professed to be the work of Pietro Soave Polano, an anagram of Paolo Sarpi Veneto. An English translation of the original Italian was published in London, 1620, by Nathaniel Brent.

† Mr. Bliss, in his valuable edition of Wood's *Athenæ Oxon.*, mistakenly says that Queen Elizabeth had formed so favourable an opinion of Cranmer, that she would have him and no other finish the Irish war. His quoted authority is Loyd; but Loyd, who stole the passage from Sir Robert Naunton, says this not of Cranmer, but of Mountjoy.

of Sir Thomas Wilsford, of Ilden, in the county of Kent, who was probably her kinsman. He next married Anne, the daughter of Thomas Southcote. His third wife is described by Hasted as Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Nevinson, of Eastry, gent. By her also he had one daughter.

When James I. ascended the throne, Sir Edwin Sandys found state employment,—possibly as an ambassador to Holland. In the Preface to the *Europæ Speculum* (ed. 1629), he is described (probably by Lewis Owen, who certainly edited other editions of that work) as “a gentleman who deserved right well of his country, in service of the Prince of Orange and the Lords the States-general, his Majesty of England’s fast friends and allies.”

He received the honour of Knighthood from the new King, May 11, 1603; and also then, or shortly after, received from the same source of wealth and honour other and more substantial tokens of the Royal favour, the particulars of which we reserve for the next article.

CORRESPONDENCE.

NEO-CHRISTIAN COMMUNION.

SIR,

BEFORE putting pen to paper on a theme so commonly reputed clerical and professional, I should perhaps have respectfully and quietly awaited communications from other quarters, whence the wind of doctrine might probably blow more welcome and more wholesome, as well as with more force. Yet a few thoughts from laymen, especially from lay preachers, may be at least admissible for consideration; and we often find that a delay of expression causes our sentiments to appear out of season. Besides, Professor Tayler’s valuable and anxious invocation of sympathy and suggestion is apology sufficient for any one to write quickly who thinks he has a quickening hint to offer. Such a hint may perhaps also come better from one who, dissatisfied with Unitarianism as it is and as it has, alas! too long been, has taken a stand-point outside the circle of denominational concert, although finding his mind frequently in harmony with what is “said or sung” here and there.

The phrase just cited is of course symptomatic of vexed questions of worship as well as of doctrine. And indubitably such questions must be again and again repeated; yet, let us faithfully and charitably hope, with less and less of vexation in them, in proportion as they are treated in a devout, frank, wise and earnest spirit. I approach the subject or subjects embraced in Mr. Tayler’s last Heidelberg letter, concerning *English Unitarians*, with a simple desire for better knowledge and a heartfelt design to aid with the best of my ability the progress towards “a consummation devoutly to be wished.” But now let us ask each other very bluntly, What is the “consummation”? Is it the amalgama-

mation of Trinitarians with Unitarians in worship, doctrine and churchhood?

It cannot be fairly denied that the spirit of candour and catholicity is diffused in our age to an extent which perhaps no former age, in England at least, has so well known. And the tendency is obviously to make free thought ripe and free communion ripe,—or nearly so. But, on the part of whom? Admit it;—of the hitherto reputed orthodox increasingly; of the heterodox perhaps a little more than before. The former lay a decreasing stress upon such dogmas as the Trinity, man's depravity, hell's torments, and so forth; while the latter, speaking through the abundant hearts of such men as Mr. Tayler, confess their sins of omission in not making and seeking wholesome communion of soul through faith which is in Christ Jesus. And why should not these both seek and make such union, of solemn choice at least, if not of social necessity? I can readily believe that, were *such* persons to confer upon the ways of salvation and the wants of spiritual communion, oblivious or at least unobservant of the differences which had kept them mutually aloof, their participation in community of religious worship, Christian doctrine and spiritual edification, would be at once feasible and fertile in good to all. Nor can I see any reason, save want of will, for their not being united. But then let us not overlook or forget what this presupposes; namely, that the once orthodox have become (in effect) heterodox,—have at all events ceased to be sticklers for the vexed questions of dogma which stood in oppugnancy and still stand in contrariety; and, on the other hand, that the already heterodox are willing to use such means as are essential to the professed end of zealous and devout communion;—no trifling and no certain postulates these! Can the problem be solved without either these or some such *data*? Where are these to be found? Would to God they were palpable or hopefully accessible! They may, for aught I know, be both; or, if not so, the very *lack* of such instrumentality as Mr. Tayler proposes may be the prevention. I think, however, that there are other causes of obstruction and alienation to which I will pointedly allude in the sequel. At this stage of the argument I wish to ask whether I overstate the difficulties (which in so brief a sketch I can barely shadow forth) in the way of close and faithful communion between persons who have agreed to “sink dogmatic differences,” and to be Christ-like in love as well as Christians in faith and hope, for the avowed purpose of steadfast religious assemblies in a mode of worship, of faith and of teaching, which they hold in common.

But even if I be guilty of exaggeration (of which I am not aware) in the foregoing hypotheses, how about those sincerely orthodox persons who, while denouncing Athanasian sentences, cannot conscientiously renounce a firm belief in THE *Trinity* of old-fashioned Nonconformist Christians, nor of the collateral and confluent doctrines of their theological code? These believers could neither feel their souls comforted or duly fed with Unitarian edification, how spiritually soever expressed, nor fail to derange frightfully the spiritual or moral digestion of their “Socinian” fellow-worshipers by their theological viands.

I specify such a case distinctly, with the view of learning by contrast what is the *matériel* of the combination of forces whose consummation is devoutly wished. At the same time, I take it for granted that our

excellent adviser Mr. Tayler is not now proposing or imagining any such church-work as this. Yet I would cordially join him in wishing even this practicable; nor can we presume to opine what God, in his ways which are not our ways, may bring about in confutation of our present assumptions. Keeping close, however, to our ease of consultation, I regard it as resolving itself into a trial whether two or more (perhaps many more) parties of Christians, some hitherto Unitarian and continuing such, some hitherto Trinitarians and more or less continuing so too, cannot so far consent, for the purpose of spiritual communion, as nor to be *Anti-Trinitarian*. What each and all may think of the Trinity and Unity of God is to be abnormal as it regards the constitution of their association, but a normal condition of individual members. This is to be kept sacredly as a question between each member and God; not to be made at all a question of Christian edification, or at least and at most, only so much so as to stop quite short of *judgment* against others thereon. The parties thus essaying to pray, to preach and to practise in concerted union as Christians, would, in other words (and I use these words reverently), rest content to dispense with all cases of *theological arithmetic* regarding the Divine Essence, provided always that they could sustain and enhance the capacity of their souls for admission and comprehension of God's Holy Spirit within them. They would fain, by these means of religious influence, get and give proofs how very little numerical computation or pure head-work has really to do with that which is only (and how incalculably! how indescribably!) cognizable to the heart, the spirit, the soul of man. That such Christian union is practicable, I am glad to join with deep-judging men like Mr. Tayler in believing. But then I respectfully urge again and again, it must be CHRIST-IAN union; and I am but too painfully aware of "the tug of war," not in mere words, but in matter of faith and its bulwarks, to which this phrase may give rise. Faith towards God should be as implicit, as its confession towards man should be explicit, if made towards man at all. Before any men, while they are such as men know themselves to be, can unite religiously with a common effort for a common object, they must make *some* sort of "confession of faith,"—call it by what name you will,—to their fellows, if not to the world at large. Nor need this be a bitter "bone of contention," if the necessary question be treated in the spirit of such an union as we have above supposed possible and desirable. And, if not so treated, such a union is, by the practical negative, proved undesirable, and perhaps also impossible. The very introduction of the name of "CHRIST," and still more the recognition of him as supreme over our souls by the manifestation of God's own decree for his appointment,—this alone is enough to hatch a large brood of hungry moral questions. "*What think ye of Christ?*" with varied emphasis on each word of the interrogation, will be over and over again asked, and must be more or less frequently answered, if "Christ" is in the creed at all. I here use the term "creed" advisedly, because you and I and Mr. Tayler are thoroughly agreed that Jesus Christ must not be ignored; nay more, that Christ Jesus must be openly confessed as a salient point of each one's "*credo*," ere the desired Christian union can be formed. And now, Sir, shall I be impertinent or too bold if I state that on the pivot which I am now touching turn the delicate questions, why the Unitarians are so ineffective for spiritual

agency,—why the liberally orthodox are loth to consort with Unitarians in church unions or congregational endeavours after Christian development,—why Unitarian Christianity languishes and labours in vain as a *denominational power*,—why, to the surprise of Unitarians themselves, their religious views are not “popular,” or, if approved by others at all openly, are so chiefly by persons of a sceptical caste of mind.

Their love of liberty, shewn in “free inquiry,” in their hatred (often excessive) of the merest likeness of settled “creeds,” in their most praiseworthy respect for the consciences of others as well as of their own, in various other noble characteristics of the Unitarians, mental, moral and political, is unquestionable as a fact, but questionable as an instrument of fidelity in “faith.” While they have contended zealously and honourably for that “liberty wherewith Christ has made us free,” they have perhaps been apt to forget or but partially regard the fact expressed, namely, that it was “CHRIST” that made them free, and that therefore they owe to Jesus Christ a homage incompatible with any hypothesis which denies to him a peculiar oneness in spirit with God. Many most admirable Christians of the free orthodox type are indisposed from their inmost souls to combine with Unitarians,—and so are many spiritually-minded monotheists who revere The Christ of God,—because they do not discern such a spirit among Unitarians as betokens faith firmly set upon what is vulgarly called “supernatural attestation” that God was with him. On the contrary, persons of sceptical complexion of soul, for this very reason, feel *they* would be heart and hand with Unitarians, if the latter would but take the one step further of treating such evidence with supineness, if not with actual suppression. And this very step is just what sceptics on the one hand, believers in miraculous powers on the other, have witnessed Unitarians often taking in modern times. I am not censuring the Unitarians for so thinking and acting. I only seek and suggest reasons for a phenomenon, apparently unaccountable to Unitarians themselves, and beginning to be irksome to the earnest hearts amongst them. They must, as I apprehend, if they would feel more spiritual life within them, and if they would engage others in helping them to cherish such life, not leave their communion nor the world around them in any doubt that they believe Jesus Christ to have been in an especial manner and in a singular degree *imbued with the spirit and power of God* for the salvation and governance of the souls of men both here and hereafter.

Very likely Professor Tayler may entirely concur with me here. It may be said that he has obviously *implied* this, or something very like it, in his last letter. But such a solemn subject of vital belief must not be left to implication or intention. Unless it be named as a specific point of Christian credence on the part of those who would enter into such a Christian union as we seem to be contemplating, the union will be a body *sans* a soul. Not that there is to be any subscription to formularies of faith or anything of the sort. Not that persons, whose minds unavoidably repudiate such belief, are to be precluded from attendance upon the ministrations of such a communion. Not that any teachers or trustees or any such persons are to be fettered. But simply that the regular teaching and worship and means of edification in such a communion should be marked by an unmistakeable recognition of such a principle of faith concerning Jesus Christ. Whether the *teachers* in any

church or congregation be one or more, these men should be especially and unquestionably known as being thoroughly persuaded in their own minds, upon calm, conscientious and severely tried conviction, that the Divine Spirit dwelt in Jesus Christ in a manner and a degree unprecedented and unrivalled ; in short (to use customary terms on the subject), that God peculiarly, miraculously, *inspired* our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. We must not stay here to descant on the large and laboured theories of Inspiration. To the main point at issue it matters little if it be even proved (an improbable proof, I trow) that the marvellous endowment of Jesus Christ was a singularly high order of spiritual GENIUS. The grand fact remains patent in history and philosophy alike, *viz.*, that it *was* that *very* singular order. And, as it seems to my struggling perceptions, this grand specialty of the character and circumstances of Christ Jesus, should be preserved salient among the features of any congregational embodiment which is desirous of enkindling or duly retaining its spiritual *ritus*. Worship in whatever mode, discourse on whatever theme, converse with whomsoever of the fellow-members, should unobtrusively indeed, but yet always unobliviously, shew by phraseology, by allusion, by tone, by varying though veritable indications, that belief is held in what is vulgarly called the *miraculous*, the *supernatural*, the *divinely-inspired*, essence of the testimony of Jesus Christ and his gospel. By no means does it follow that we must be censorious or unsympathizing towards those who evince a Thomasine temper. We shall be always wrong, if we scold or scoff at the most unbelieving ; we should feel ever bound, spiritually though not literally, to beseech them to reach hither their fingers and feel the prints,—hoping there may yet be amongst them chosen vessels well-nigh ready and burnished for the Master's holy service. Nor in doing thus are we directly or indirectly precluding "anti-supernaturalists," as they have sometimes been called, from entering into separate communions of their own, in which they prefer to *dis-own* the "miraculous," the "supernatural," and to treat such accessories of Truth as mere bits of "legendary and allegorical accretion." In such avowal and avoidance let them pursue their conscientious way unmolested, if only on the common ground of doing as we would be done by. But to let alone, and even to treat with respect, neither are "communion," nor the sure harbingers of communion. There is such a thing as respectful distance ; and there was once a mandate of Jehovah, that, as Ephraim was turned unto idols, the people should let him alone. We in this age have *no* such mandate ; let us never forget this fact. Also let us never forget or forego, as of little weight in the affairs of the soul, the preponderance of proofs of the Spirit of God in Jesus Christ.

May I speak out very plainly what is whispered frequently in corners and occasionally proclaimed from the house-top ? Free inquiry among Unitarians has produced superfluity of negation. Such negation has begotten an habitual spirit of scepticism concerning sacred things, although frequently with a devout and reverent love of all truth which can approve itself as divine. The sceptical spirit of their negative theology has, unconsciously to themselves, frittered away both the comfort and the sustenance of spiritual energy and heaven-born life. The cold waters of philosophic problem in the pulpit have gradually quenched the fires of spiritual faith in their people. By their apathetic intellect-

tualism of doctrine, and their cold consideration of taste in theology, they are and have long been unwittingly dethroning Christ Jesus from their own hearts and dis-christianizing the rising generation ; and then they wonder at the defection of these latter either towards Secularism and Atheism, or at least Theism, on the one hand,—towards Episcopalianism, Romanism and other forms and phases of “orthodoxy,” on the other hand ! Surely, Sir, no free reader of human nature and human history will contend that such a cement of religious belief and co-operation as the special one on which I have been insisting, is a mere fiction of credulity *versus* incredulity, a pure product of CHRISTIAN DOGMA ? No ! no ! Deists and even so-called Atheists, if of a studious and an honest calibre of mind, are above the charge of so treating what has ever been the concomitant of *spiritual* faith and force amongst men : I mean the soul-stirring sense of special opportunities of intercourse between the worshiper and the worshiped, between man and his God, or his Gods. We claim for Jesus Christ that he enjoyed in an especial manifestation, *par excellence*, what is graciously offered to all human beings in varying degrees,—THE SPIRIT OF THE MOST HIGH. But when we contemplate union as believers in him, we must lay down as a preliminary that “God gave not His spirit by measure unto him,” and that *for such reasons* we meet in church, in chapel, in congregation of whatever name, as progressive disciples of Jesus Christ. We hold that he gave us the principles of spiritual truth and life as he received them by direct SPECIAL derivation from God.

On the question of the name by which persons, uniting in such religious communions as we canvass, should be known, obviously much might be written. It is equally obvious that such a denomination should be significant alike of faith in Jesus as “THE CHRIST,” and of a spirit of religious progress according to the new *developments* which eighteen centuries of phenomena, to say nothing of other tokens internal and external, constrain us to regard as indispensable to God’s revelations in general, and to His revelation through His Son Jesus Christ in particular. Pardon the Lindley-Murrayism of the remark, that names are words ; and words are signs of ideas ; and ideas should be significant as well as signified. An insignificant thing, whether an idea or what not, does not, cannot “signify much.” Now we, of course, wish our new name (if we get or give one) to be simply significant of some mode and movement, in the religious life of the nineteenth century, which shall be anything but insignificant. We wish to be liberal, yet definite ; learned, yet not at all pedantic ; spiritually-minded, yet thoroughly imbued with common sense ; not so much *protesters* against and *dissenters* from what is amongst Christians, as *contesters* for and *consenters* to what ought to be, according to the Saviour’s perennial prayer for oneness, in John xvii.

Nothing, therefore, in the very name chosen, should savour of exclusiveness, except always the exclusion of “anti-christ,” q. d. contravention of the divine *anointment* of Jesus by God Himself. The personal and moral disposition of the *chrism* may remain a varied though not a vexed question. But the fundamental fact of the divine chrism being poured upon Jesus of Nazareth, must be treated as above and beyond question in the communion desired. However formidable to minds which are fondly habituated to negations, this must be *positive* in our

groundwork of construction. Anticipating sensitive objections, I add that this will not fetter any free spirit of exposition from the pulpit, the press, or the social circle of faithful friends thus united. A Dr. Channing equally with a Dr. Priestley, a James Martineau equally with an Edward Higginson, a Thomas Lynch as well as a Thomas Madge, might expatriate in this broad arena as *dramatis personæ* of the same well-cast company. When one makes a round of pulpits as a hearer, one cannot resist the conviction how many are the tangible points of convergence in Christian doctrine now, as compared with what one used to see. Often, however, one cannot help feeling,—sometimes one cannot help saying,—to an "*orthodox*" prophet on the one hand, to a so-disavowed "*heterodox*" prophet on the other,—“Your expressed views are surely alike *RIGHT*, if either is right, for those of the one are *not* ‘other’ than those of the other in scope and in spirit; they differ only, and sometimes hardly that, in *phraseology* of utterance.” Lest I become too personal, I will not cite names of noted men. Instances will rise, I should think, vividly in the minds of hearers and readers. If not so, let them ventilate their ideas by stepping now and then out of the confined atmosphere of sect into freer and fairer mental breathing. To do this, they need not be “going to all sorts of chapels;” it will be enough if they encourage dispassionate religious intercourse with *any* good people. While, therefore, great elasticity of solemn thought should be allowed and encouraged, without congregational checks or interferences, upon such topics as the personality of the Godhead in connection with Jesus Christ, and what I may term the *alchemy* of spiritual agency, still a *negative* or an *ignoring* treatment of God’s own Spirit in His own Christ must be strictly precluded. And this uncompromising stricture should press with full force upon those who, whether as pastors, teachers, deacons or other *ministers* in the communion, may, nay (as custom bids) must, be regarded as the duly chosen *representatives* of the common “*FAITH*.” Even these, moreover, must be always enabled to feel themselves free from manacles and molestation in the formation and change of their opinions; but this must be upon one just and plain condition, *viz.*, that *they be promptly candid in the avowal of change so far as it affects what is known as POSITIVE ground of union*. There is frequently great good, there is comparatively little harm at worst, in the most radical change of opinion, if it be calm and conscientious. But, where men have become deeply conscious within themselves of such changes, and yet salve or sear their own consciences with I know not what plea of expediency in continuing to utter as teachers what they reject from head and heart as learners,—there we cannot fail to see jeopardy, especially for *young* hearers, not only of opinions hitherto held dear and divine, but of simplicity and sincerity and healthful energy in the whole discipline and conduct of the soul. He who declares outright his unbelief in things held sacred, is far less likely to do harm to society, particularly to *youthful* companions and listeners, than the man who cloaks a body of sceptical negation under a nicely-woven wrapper of timeserving utterances.

What has all this, some one may say, to do with a name? Why this at least, if not more,—that it be a true sign of recognized ideas. And both the sign and the ideas will be assuredly characterized (or contradicted) by the men selected as their congregational exponents. The

positive grounds of faith and union once agreed upon by such as will be parties to the same, then upon this basis taken, it should be true of every one who publicly expounds and illustrates the tenets, that he is

*"Though learn'd, well-bred; and though well-bred, sincere;
Modestly bold, and humanely severe."*

And now, one passing touch upon the shrugged shoulders of those valued friends,—and there are some few of such clever and amiable malecontents amongst Unitarians,—who desiderate as a panacea for religious disorders, that our basis of communion should be extended over so wide an area as to include all in its embrace who are disposed to be philanthropically religious, of whatever faith. You must bear in mind that, while we have *any* “positive belief,” we stand, how much soever without our design or against our will, in contradiction with either those who (if we may use the phrase) have a *negative belief*, or, again, those who hold a belief *positively* differing from our own; and that those who are indifferent about distinct or definite belief could ill consort with those who deem it all in all. Let us, however, choose a designation that is at any rate not repulsive.

Without repeating the catalogues of theological nomenclature and shewing how each title is unfit for the purpose, and without citing more than one or two (e. g. Newtonian Christians, Primitive Christians, Independent Christians) which explain their especial import for themselves and thereby prove their nominal inconsistency, let us handle a fact or two lying clear on the breast of history. “*The Reformation*,” whether by Wycliffe, by Luther, by Erasmus, or by Henry VIII., was Protestant; and those who have disagreed with it, or with whom it has disagreed, through insufficient or improper nutrition for the soul, have been fitly termed Dissenters; the Non-catholic being Protestant Dissenters. The ecclesiastical course of procedure may be sketched thus:—The apostles and their immediate converts *formed*; Constantine perhaps *de-formed*; the Roman Catholic Church *trans-formed*; the mighty men above named *re-formed*; Britain generally, England particularly, *con-formed*; and those who protested against doing so, acquired the name of *non-con-formists*. They all *per-formed* well their several parts. Let them in-form us how to act ours. They all concerned themselves far less with what their forefathers did than with what *themselves had to do*. Our age, I fear, in religious concerns very much needs such examples. There is now, and has long been, so much of dwelling upon the glories of the past in well-meant words; so much of foreshadowing the future in ideal churches; so much of reviving in form and fashion what was a warm life once, but can be little else than a galvanized corpse now; such fitfully anachronous adaptations of past and future in many matters, but above all in religion,—that “the living present” almost “lies an unregarded thing,” pines, gasps, and is lost! Now, if we would do anything worth the doing, we must imitate our most honoured ancestors, whether in religion or in polities or in morals, *not* by doing or trying to do just what they *did*, how noble soever may have been their deeds; but in the present spirit, with the present energy, for the present purpose, according to the present circumstances. We must “let the dead past bury its dead;” and only so far interest ourselves in the *future* of faith, that we may render “the living present” a step as steady and

a stride as strong as it is possible for good men and true of the time being to make it.

Our name, then, might perhaps best be derived from what we shall have *done*, when we have got really to work on a right basis, than by what it is our devout *intention* to do, if we can find or feign it. In meantime a designation is desirable; and, all points reconsidered, I can devise none so expressive of devotion to "*Christ*" consentaneously with a spirit of progressive willingness to re-construct from time to time, to rid the communion of wrong and root it well in right,—as that which your own *P E R I O D I C A L* presents. Let us be always, in fact as well as in name, "*CHRISTIAN REFORMERS*." True to this title, we shall dispense with all *dogmas*, except (if they must be termed "*dogmas*") the doctrines of belief in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the oneness of the Father with the Son, the Holy Spirit given by the Father without measure unto Jesus Christ,—and the *progressive* nature of God's revelation of Himself, His Christ, His Holy Spirit, His worship, and His truth to those amongst the children of men who seek the bread of eternal life. In terming ourselves "*Christian Reformers*," we shall of course be likewise friends of religious freedom and advocates of moral progress. Higher and holier grounds than these, how can we tread in this world? Another world, another phase of this world, will doubtless unfold other phenomena, and other forms of faith amongst them. But that will be the busy scene of other souls and other works than our own actual "*present*." With *this* we have now to do. Let us, as Christ-like regenerators of the spirit that is in man, and first and foremost of each one's own individual spirit within oneself, try with *positive* faith and *spiritual* practice to enhance and enlarge the new brotherhood of man.

Excuse the haste with which my pen has run to this length; and believe me to remain, yours faithfully,

S. C. FREEMAN.

Highbury New Park, December 11, 1856.

CAUSE OF THE SLOW PROGRESS OF UNITARIANISM.

SIR,

THE subject brought under the attention of your readers by the Rev. J. J. Tayler in your last number, is one of the greatest importance to our denomination, and has recently been much considered amongst us.

We all feel that the avowal of our opinions does not progress in proportion to the extent in which they are really held. We know that the fundamental doctrines and principles of Unitarian Christianity commend themselves to the intellects and hearts of thousands who do not join our communion; and, what is more mortifying still, we perceive that considerable numbers of those who have been brought up as Unitarians, on arriving at maturity either become perfectly lukewarm and indifferent, or unite themselves, outwardly at least, with other churches.

For all this there must be a cause, and it is matter for rejoicing that so many amongst us are continually asking what that cause can be.

The suggestions are, as might be expected, various. One inquirer laments that Unitarians are "a rope of sand," and finds in a system of church government a panacea for the evils deplored. Another has faith in the attraction and binding efficacy of a simple formulary in the nature of a creed. A third recommends an improved style of pulpit oratory in our ministers. A fourth, increased liberality in the support of the ministers by the laity. A fifth has great confidence in a liturgy and improved singing. A sixth declares we have too many sermons, and proposes that discourses of that description should be only occasional. A seventh ascribes our want of progress to our name, and is sure we should make rapid advances if we would but cease to call ourselves Unitarians, and adopt the designation of Presbyterians, Free Christians, or any other appellation, if indeed we cannot be content with simply styling ourselves Christians. This list of suggestions might be greatly extended; but the foregoing instances will suffice to shew the point of view from which the subject is usually regarded, and the nature of the remedies suggested to overcome our acknowledged hitherto ill success.

The fault of all such suggestions is, that they are secondary and not primary,—that they apply a material remedy to a spiritual need. For, Sir, I contend that the chief of all reasons for the want of progression of avowed Unitarian Christianity, is the want of earnest, heartfelt conviction amongst its professors of the value of their own opinions, and their failure to appreciate the great fact, that it is upon the basis of the principles of Unitarian Christianity alone that that Church of the Future can be founded, of which Christ shall be truly the Head, and every member shall unhesitatingly acknowledge that each is accountable to God alone for the use of the intelligence he has received from his Creator. Now this conviction can only be attained by comprehending what Christianity is, and to do this we must dismiss from our minds all the creeds, confessions, catechisms and articles that have ever been composed, and make the New Testament, and especially the Gospels, our study; and I believe the result of that study will be to teach us that the true Christian is he who, believing in One God, the Father, and in Jesus as His divinely-appointed Messenger, strives as Jesus did to realize in his life the two great commandments, which contain so brief but so comprehensive a summary of the whole duty of man. Jesus was Christianity personified. He, therefore, is the best Christian who most resembles Jesus. Now one of the most striking characteristics of Jesus is his thorough earnestness, not only in doing his duty himself, but in exhorting others to do theirs also, and in instructing those who were willing to listen to him in "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven." In this earnestness in the inculcation of truth which so distinguished Jesus and those who immediately learnt of him and imbibed his spirit, Unitarians are lamentably deficient, and this deficiency arises from a mistaken notion respecting Christian charity. They see the Christian world divided into a number of sects, each animated with furious hostility against the others; they say, This is not Christianity; let us take no part in the turmoil; let us be at no pains to make our opinions known: these people do indeed quarrel and anathematize one another lustily; they all abuse *us* in good set terms, being nevertheless for the most part utterly ignorant of what our opinions are; still, in their own way, they are all doing some good; let not us interfere even to correct

their misapprehensions; by doing so we shall only make "confusion worse confounded."

Now such conduct as this, instead of being Christian, is exactly the reverse. We are convinced that these people are all in the wrong, and that, with the very best intentions, they are materially damaging the success of the cause in whose interests they are labouring. We know what is required to set them right, and yet we are told that Christian charity requires that we should abstain from using any active means to impart our knowledge. Surely this is not to imitate Jesus! Unitarians, strangely enough, consider it their duty to instruct people in all branches of knowledge except the most important of all, viz., religious knowledge; and in this branch of knowledge they too frequently take but little pains to cultivate either the heads or hearts of those over whom they possess influence. Disgusted with the bigotry of those who think salvation is confined to their own sect, they rush to the other extreme, and treat religion as a mere branch of philosophy, inviting intellectual speculation in those who are inclined to that sort of study, but with which the affections have no concern. Thus to act is to fly in the face of all historical experience. One of the great truths history teaches is, that no religion, Pagan or Christian, has exercised any influence except in so far as it dwelt in the hearts and possessed the affections of its votaries. In religion, the head has always occupied a place second to the heart. The error of Unitarians is, that they endeavour to counteract this, and give the supremacy in religion to the intellect. In thus acting, we lose sight of the cardinal characteristic of the Christian religion, which is *mutual love*,—the love of God to men, the love of men to God, the love of men to each other. Now love does not spring from the intellect, but from the affections; and hence it frequently happens that vital Christianity is better appreciated by the unlettered, the humble, the simple-minded, than by those who stand high in the world's estimation for intellectual endowments. Unitarians fear to appear to be in earnest, and therefore they fail to make people believe that they have any religious earnestness. How is this principle of love, now so dormant, to be quickened? Principally, I believe, by united philanthropic action. Not by giving a few guineas a-year to schools and missions and such-like institutions, but by taking an active working part in some benevolent enterprize. The more we do this, the better we shall appreciate Christianity; and the better we appreciate Christianity, the more fervently shall we desire the extension of that phase of it which alone in any intelligible sense recognizes God as the universal Father, and all mankind as brethren.

I regret to find that your esteemed correspondent favours the State Church. Of all inconsistencies, I know not where to find a greater than the sympathy expressed by many Unitarians with the Established Church. The Church of Rome is far more worthy of respect than the Church of England. The former is an outspoken, comprehensible institution; the latter is the greatest deception that has ever been practised upon mankind. In point of theological dogma, there is little to choose between them; for the Church in England is so full of absurdities, that a few additional ones,—as the worship of the Virgin and Saints, the addition of five sacraments, and such-like,—are really not worth mentioning. In point of uniformity between its theory and practice, the

Church of Rome is far more honest than that of England. The former avows and defends the right and duty of persecuting heretics even to the death; it denies the right of private judgment, and confesses that its theological tenets are not derived solely from the Scriptures. The Church of England asserts the right of private judgment, yet visits with such penalties as it can enforce those who, in exercising that right, differ from its standard of orthodoxy for the time being. Equally with the Roman Catholics, it can boast of its St. Bartholomew's-day. During the reigns of Charles II. and James II., not fewer than 60,000 persons suffered persecution for refusing to yield to its tyranny. Remember its Irish history. Every one knows, too, that till of late years Dissenters were excluded from offices of honourable ambition, and that even now the road to the highest advancement in the State is exclusively through the portals of the Church. Mr. Froude's Nemesis of Faith was burned by the authorities of his College at Oxford not many years since: the animus that kindled this fire would have exposed the author to the flames instead of his book, if the spirit of the times had not prevented such a gratification of the true spirit of Popery. The Church of England professes to be based upon the Bible and the Bible only; and yet only the other day Mr. Denison was deprived by the Archbishop of Canterbury himself, not for preaching doctrines opposed to the Bible, but doctrines opposed to the Articles; and he was not allowed to attempt to prove that his preaching was in accordance with Scripture, for had he succeeded in proving this, it would have availed him nothing, because his preaching was contrary to the Articles.

The inducements held out by the State Church to, at any rate, a nominal adhesion to it, are most injurious to the spread of truth, by repelling many from inquiry, and stifling its results in others. Again, the enormous wealth accumulated and the arrogance exhibited by its prelates and clergy, disgust thousands with Christianity altogether.

The apprehension sometimes entertained that the Calvinistic Dissenters would gain an ascendancy if the connection between the Church and State were abolished, is, I am convinced, perfectly futile. The different sects are far too disunited and too jealous of each other to permit the possibility of any one dominating over the rest. The result of the dissolution of the unholy connection would be, to let loose a flood of valuable thought which is now cooped up within the narrow limits of a sect, and is not strong enough to make for itself a vent; it would free Christianity from much of the obloquy now unjustly cast upon it, and conduce to that impartial search after truth, in which too many even of most excellent Christians have been so lamentably deficient.

December 15, 1856.

H. J. PRESCOTT.

MR. SOLLY ON MR. TAYLER'S LETTER.

SIR,

I THINK Unitarians are under considerable obligations to Mr. Tayler for his interesting letters in the Reformer, but especially for the last. What he has there said respecting the wants of our denomination and the way to meet them, is just the word which was most needed at the present time, and which, coming from such a quarter, will secure re-

spectful, earnest attention. As both he and you invite discussion, I thankfully offer the following suggestions, should your space not be occupied by more important communications.

There can, I think, be no doubt that our great need is the recognition of some definite positive belief, as a vital centre "of sympathy and joint action." Unless we can rally round such a centre, we shall not only speedily perish as a denomination, but shall surely deserve such a fate. Controversy, destruction, negations, and even the mere right of free inquiry, never were intended to be the bond of union between earnest men, in the church of Christ or out of it. Hence I entirely agree with Mr. Tayler in his dislike of the name "Unitarian," which, however affirmative in itself, was originally fastened on our Presbyterian body as a title antagonistic to Trinitarian. But I also agree with him, that "if we can only develop a more earnest Christian life under it, the name will signify little; it will be superseded by a better, or acquire a new signification." Twenty years of hearty self-sacrificing work on the part of our churches, by which the name of Unitarian might be made synonymous in every part of the kingdom with Christian piety and benevolence, would change its significance, would make it a worthy and honoured symbol. I, for one, should gladly endure any sectarian title, however objectionable it might be, if those who bore it were working nobly as followers of the crucified Christ, and I were privileged to labour with them. But I doubt whether such a new development of Christian life will or can take place under this old controversial title. For such a result, we need the co-operation of persons who, I fear, will never work and pray with us, so long as, by retaining our antagonistic symbol, we appear to occupy a controversial position; and who, I grieve to add, are repelled from our name and sect by what we are informed is currently termed "the Unitarian chill." I may be wrong in fearing that we can have no real revival of religious life and power without a broader denominational symbol. I hope I am; for we are not likely to get it, at present. There may be faith and zeal enough in our own ranks to effect such a revival without help from those who are outside of us. We can at all events each resolve that failure shall not come through our own individual treachery.

But I cannot agree with Mr. Tayler in preferring the name of "Protestant Dissenter," honourable in many respects as that title is. It is a double negation, and essentially antagonistic. I have long thought that the best and simplest name for a church of Christ is that of "Christian Disciples." It includes the two earliest designations of believers in the Lord Jesus. It expresses our relation to him in an unsectarian, reverential fashion, and, though by no means defining the position which a confirmed believer in Christ would desire to occupy, it is all the better fitted on that account to be the symbol of a society which desires to combine the greatest possible freedom that is compatible with any recognition of Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God.

But leaving the question of names, and returning to that of what they are to symbolize, it will be evident that Mr. Tayler's position as to the necessity of some "definite, positive belief" for the centre and source of our denominational life, is the true one, when we consider how the Christian church comes to be in existence at all. It was faith in great truths which first established that church, and it is faith in great

truths which has always awakened or cherished religious life in it since. And when the question arises, "Out of all the glorious truths revealed to us by Christianity, which are we to select as necessary to be received by all who would be members of our Christian church?" Mr. Tayler's answer appears to me right and true. It is substantially this: The bond of union between us, and the vital principle that is to give us life and power, is faith in the likeness of Christ to God,—belief that he was nearer to God than any other being that has trod this earth,—faith, therefore, in the divinity of his character, his nature and his spirit,—faith that our perfection, our likeness to, our union with God, is to be accomplished, therefore, by growing in the likeness, possessing the spirit, of Christ. "This is Christianity," says Mr. Tayler, "as I understand it; this is its central principle, its proper work,—the union of the soul with God in the self-sacrificing spirit of Christ." I accept this solution of a very important problem. I thank Mr. Tayler for coming forward to urge it on our notice. I should differ, probably, from him—we should all differ more or less from one another, as men of independent thought must do—on many important questions within this general circle; but as a basis on which all earnest Christians may meet and work lovingly together, and lovingly compare their various views of truth, and as a principle from which we must all derive our primal and our highest impulse to Christian piety and benevolence, I am persuaded it is the truest and best that has been offered,—that it is that rock on which the church of Christ was founded by the Son of God, according to the sacred records.

You, Sir, advert to the difficulty, however, connected with worship. I admit the difficulty. Persons cannot pray and worship together who differ as to the Object of their worship. I admit also that Mr. Tayler's principle does not directly meet the case. But I submit that it is for all who accept that principle as their basis of church fellowship to take it for granted that those who meet upon it will worship Him whom Christ worshiped and taught us to worship, viz., "Our Father in heaven." Until the reverse be shewn, we are to assume that unto all who so meet together, as unto Paul, "there is but one God, the Father,.... and one Lord, Jesus Christ." And practically, such a basis as the above would unquestionably prevent any misunderstanding, unless in very rare and exceptional cases. Few who believed that it was their duty to worship and pray to Christ as God, would be content to accept the above principle as the sole basis of church fellowship and united prayer.

One word in reference to organization. Mr. Tayler admits the need of better organization than we possess at present. But, he says, "It is idle to talk of organization till there is something active and vigorous to organize." But he seems to take it too much for granted that there is not any life now waiting for suitable organization whereby to manifest and unfold itself. I am persuaded that there is, and that we are wasting it by delay. Again, he says, "Juxtaposition of dead members, however artificially contrived, will not produce a living organism." True; but juxtaposition of a living and a torpid body may revive the latter; and that is what I believe suitable organization might now assist in doing. Again, he says, with most seasonable truth and earnestness, "Put a strong religious conviction into men's minds, make them feel it a reality on which their life and being stand, and nothing will be im-

possible to their united zeal." But to enable men who have such convictions to impart them effectually and *continuously* to those who have not, you want organization, viz., missionary funds, meetings for conference and prayer, funds to pay expenses attending these meetings, for printing and distributing papers, lectures and tracts. Therefore I say that *some* organization is wanted even to commence the revival of religious faith and zeal. Organization will not produce life *a priori*. But as soon as two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ—nay, as soon as but one man aims at imparting the faith and zeal which animate himself—organization is needed; and the more perfect that organization, the more efficiently such persons will be able to bring their own inner life to influence the life of their brethren.

There may be quite enough organization in our denomination to give the first new impulse to our faith and works, *if it is rightly used*. And if a more vigorous zeal and a more living faith is gradually developed, all outward arrangements will grow *pari passu*. Only let us do the utmost we can with our present means, and if faithful in a few things, we shall be entrusted with more.

Wandsworth, Dec. 16, 1856.

HENRY SOLLY.

ISAIAH vii. 14.

SIR,

THAT by the child promised, Is. vii. 14, and the son whose birth is announced, Is. ix. 6, we are to understand the same individual, seems to be at least highly probable. The prediction was intended as a sign to Ahaz of the defeat and destruction of his enemies. The subject of it must have been destined to a position which would give that king opportunities of observing the circumstances of his birth and the manner of his life, until he became old enough to choose the good and to refuse the evil; and the son announced was evidently of the royal household. The high titles which were to be given to him, and the career which was marked out for him, indicate that he belonged to a family of the highest distinction, and that his birth was an event of public and national importance. Were there two persons of that age whose histories favour the opinion that they were here, and both, separately predicted? I think not. The records of the period only mention one man who could bear the titles foretold and answer the expectations raised. That man was Hezekiah. He was the child of Ahaz, born in his house and living under his eye. He, very likely, was the son of *the* virgin, who seems to have been alluded to, by that definite phrase, as a person of eminence. In his early youth, even before he could know to refuse the evil and to choose the good, while he was eating butter and honey,—living delicately,—the land which Ahaz abhorred was forsaken of both her kings, as his father had the best opportunity of knowing; and subsequently, on his, perhaps, early accession to the throne, his character, ability and successes, made him more worthy, than any other person of the time, of the foretold honours and titles; while in the destruction of Sennacherib's army, the more remarkable prediction connected with

the promise of the child of *the* virgin, and the announcement of the "son given to us," was most wonderfully fulfilled.

Your correspondent, a late Bengal Civilian, tells us that he at one time agreed with Dr. Pye Smith, that by the virgin or young woman referred to, Is. vii. 14, was meant the Queen of Ahaz; but that from a comparison of 2 Kings xvi. 2 with xviii. 12, according to which Hezekiah must have been eight or nine years old when the prophecy was delivered, he now concludes that he was mistaken in that opinion. But was the age of Hezekiah sufficient evidence of that mistake? Was the prince really so old at the time? We have, indeed, evidence in 2 Kings xvi. 2, that Ahaz was twenty years old when he began to reign, and that he reigned sixteen years; consequently he died at the age of thirty-six. We are also told, 2 Kings xviii. 2, that Hezekiah was twenty-five years old when he began to reign. If so, he was born at least nine years before the commencement of his father's reign, and therefore could not be the child whose birth was foretold in the early part of that reign. But, if so, it is evident from a comparison of those dates, that he was born when his father, who seems to have had older children than he, could not be more than ten or eleven,—a circumstance which, from its very great improbability, raises the suspicion that there may be some mistake in the chronology. If there be an error there, it is most likely in the age of Ahaz, because Jotham, the father of Ahaz, could not be more than twenty-one when that prince was born. We have, then, to choose between the admission of a mistake, which might easily be made, by a transcriber or otherwise, as to the age of Hezekiah at the commencement of his reign, and the very unlikely circumstance of Ahaz having a son, who, as I have said before, was most likely not his oldest child, born at so early a period of his own life. I think it likely that Hezekiah was not the first child of Ahaz, because early in his reign that wicked king offered his children for sacrifices to idols (2 Chron. xxviii. 2), a fate from which probably Hezekiah escaped by being then unborn; and because, also early in his reign, a son of his, who must then have been old enough to be of some importance in the state, was killed by Zechri, "a mighty man of Ephraim."

A mistake in the age of Hezekiah might easily be made by using the characters which represent two tens and five instead of those which represent one ten and five, and as such an error would make him appear twenty-five when he was only fifteen, we shall, by the admission of it, not only be freed from the improbability of his being born when his father was but in his eleventh year, but we shall have to place his birth at the exact period when, if he were the subject of the prophecy, he might be expected to appear; and we should find in him the fulfilment of both the predictions of Isaiah, for which we must otherwise look amongst the records of that age in vain; and we shall be left in possession of the opinion that by the virgin or young woman mentioned in Is. vii. 14, we are to understand the Queen of Ahaz.

December 9, 1856.

J. N.

INTELLIGENCE.

RETIREMENT OF THE REV. GEORGE ARMSTRONG.

The Rev. GEO. ARMSTRONG having, in consequence of ill health, resigned his charge as one of the pastors of LEWIN'S-MEAD CHAPEL, a charge which he had held for nearly twenty years, an Address was presented to him from the members of the society to which he has so long and so faithfully ministered.

On Sunday, Nov. 16, the Congregation having remained after the morning service, CHARLES THOMAS, Esq., the Treasurer, stated that it became his sorrowful duty to inform the meeting that the health of Mr. Armstrong had rendered it necessary that he should withdraw from public service; and that although the Committee had hoped he might still retain his connection with the congregation, even were he only occasionally to occupy the pulpit,—it was found, on communication with him, that he could no longer indulge the expectation of engaging in those services—in however modified a form—which had not only been the professional occupation of many years, but “had furnished to his life some of its most sacred and endearing pleasures.”

Mr. THOMAS then read and moved the following Address, which was seconded by SAMUEL WORSLEY, Esq., who briefly, but beautifully and touchingly, alluded to Mr. Armstrong's infirm condition, to his valuable services, and to his fidelity to the cause of Christian truth and righteousness.

Reverend and dear Sir,—We are truly grieved to learn that the impaired state of your health obliges you to resign your office as pastor of the Lewin's Mead congregation. It had been our earnest hope that God, in his great mercy, would restore your strength, and spare you to minister in coming years to a people whose privilege it has been, through a long period, to listen, we trust with profit, to the fervent and faithful exhortations which you have addressed to them. We deeply regret the loss of ministrations which have aided so many of us in the culture of the religious life; and we would thank you for the help you have thus given. We shall always gratefully remember the earnestness with which you have stood forth whenever our Religious Liberty has been assailed, and your exertions in endeavouring to gain a larger measure of it for those who shall come after us. We

shall, at the same time, call to mind the sacrifices which you have made for conscience' sake; and will take to our own hearts the example you have set, of giving up friendships, pecuniary advantages, and social position, for those opinions which we all alike profess and alike hold dear.

We feel that your retirement, and that of each earnest man who is taken from us, lays on those who remain a deeper obligation to carry on, with renewed courage and in a holier spirit, every work that lies before us as servants of Christ.

We pray that an all-wise and good God who has seen fit to afflict you, and to deprive us of a revered and beloved Minister, will, in his own good time, restore you to some measure of health, when it will be our happiness, and we believe an addition to your own, that we should seek in the quiet retirement of your study that communion of spirit which may still cheer, counsel, and strengthen us in our passage through life.

That our Heavenly Father will continue to bless you in your home and in your family,—that He will guard and guide you and yours in all the events of life,—and that one fold, even that of the Great Shepherd of the sheep, may receive us all at the last great day,—is the heartfelt and earnest prayer of your attached people!

Signed, on behalf of the congregation,
CHARLES THOMAS,

Nov. 16th, 1856. Treasurer.

To this Address, Mr. Armstrong has sent the following reply:

Durdham Park, near Bristol,
Nov. 17, 1856.

My dear Friends,—It has pleased the Almighty to restore to me some measure of strength to acknowledge—though necessarily in very imperfect words—the affectionate Address in reply to my Letter of Resignation, of which your worthy Treasurer, Mr. Chas. Thomas, was the bearer to my house last evening.

I am glad you have perceived that the course I have taken was wholly unavoidable; and that from no cause less serious than a state of health which gave but little hope of any permanent amendment, could I have been induced to dissolve a relation so solemn and so important to my people, to my family, and to myself.

For the assurance you give me that, in the course of my ministrations during an extended period of little short of twenty years, I have succeeded in deepening the religious convictions, and in helping on

the spiritual life and culture of many among you, I feel truly thankful; while it reminds me that the efficacy of all such labours can only be due to the power of that Holy Guidance which I ever sought as the alone source of all human goodness, and the best support of all human weakness. As a Christian minister, not to say as a sinning man, I felt profoundly that I could have no strength, and least of all any peace, *out of Christ*. Conscious of shortcomings great and numerous, I could not but flee to that Throne from which none were ever sent empty away,—and renewing my soul at that Fountain, caught the needed strength to assure my own heart,—and, as you kindly acknowledge,—to raise and comfort yours.

Forgive me, brethren, if in the act of thanking you I may seem to say more than the occasion would naturally elicit; and especially if I speak this as a truth on which none can too deeply reflect. The world wants more of communion with Christ. In our public life, in our home life, and chiefly and supremely of all, as including the rest—in *our solitary heart*—we need to know Christ as a power of God (not as a subject of speculation) more than we have yet known him. In the latter days of my life, and still on my sick bed, I place this truth before you with more solemnity than I could have ever done before; and I desire in this closing communication with you, dear and Christian friends, that you should feel I can neither seek for you nor for myself any higher blessing from our Heavenly Father, any more precious fruit of the mission of his Christ—as the wisdom of the God and the power of God unto salvation, in the heart of every one that believes.

As to external matters, you have been pleased to refer with satisfaction to exertions I have made from time to time in behalf of our Religious Liberties; and if I have been fortunate in some local and special efforts of that character, I am the more pleased that you have borne those efforts in mind, because it gives me the opportunity of entreating you to be thus mindful of what has hitherto been done, that you may the better see and provide for what remains to be done in this great department of your Christian duty.

In the circumstances of the present time, there seems to be a peculiar fitness in referring to the raised and liberalized character of the British Schools of this city; as to which I would earnestly desire you to remember, that having gained, or, more correctly, having recovered, a position of co-equality with other religious connections, it behoves you to be watchful

in the care of that position, and that you suffer the aggressive spirit of religious bigotry at no time to take you by surprise, or find you sleeping at your post.

In fine, whether as regards the Red-cross-Street British School, now so happily brought into practical harmony with your own; or the administration of the *Parent Society* at the Borough Road in London, whose instructive history by Mr. Leyson Lewis has been recently placed in the hands of some of the more active members of your congregation, and for whose liberal and faithful management in the equal interests of all religious denominations in this country they and others must be so largely responsible,—the more so as its restored spirit and character would so auspiciously affect the great question of a national education still pending in and out of Parliament;—or, lastly, as regards the catholic principle of another important institution of our country, the *British and Foreign Bible Society*, with its affiliated branches throughout the kingdom;—it will be among the latest and most earnest of my wishes, dear brethren, that, being *open* institutions, you omit no practical measures to *keep* them open; and that, as healthful members of Christ's body, ready to do and to say the right thing at the right time, you should, in a godly jealousy for your own and your children's liberties, do all and be all for Him who gave Himself for you, that He might purify you unto Himself as a peculiar people, zealous of good works.

Oh, brethren, “our heart is enlarged unto you!” yet to think and to write as I ought is more than I have strength for. Nevertheless, because you permit me to believe that you have profited by my earnestness, and because you console me with the idea that I have reached you, through the depth of my own feeling, on some topics of Christian exhortation,—weak as I am, I take courage in beseeching you to bear with me in yet one word more, and I have done.

“Remember,” then, I fervently exhort you, “*them that are in bonds, as bound with them.*” Bear in mind the dark and still increasing iniquity of our age! Suspect the worldly spirit of those who would think or speak lightly upon it. And as God has ordained it an eternal truth, that “righteousness only exalteth a nation,” do not believe in the real prosperity of that people—do not believe in the religion of that Church—which can see in the fearful institution of *SLAVERY* anything less than a hindrance, efficacious beyond all others, in repressing the advancement of nations, even the most distant from

the seat of the evil,—a stumbling-block to the progress and the power of the Anglo-Saxon race,—and thus by hands so unfitted for the abhorrent work, instead of entailing glory, and honour, and freedom, and virtue, and piety, on a prostrate world—weakening, degrading, demoralizing, and depressing the **WHOLE** family of man. For “we are all members one of another.” And the poorest slave in ALABAMA cannot uplift his unavailing voice for justice and mercy, without leaving so much the less of power in the world to resist the energetic tyrannies which everywhere surround us! Then take, brethren, a lesson from the enemy; and as tyrannies cling to tyrannies, and the oppressor everywhere, directly or indirectly, helps the oppressor, be you ready by word and deed, as much as in you lies, to strengthen the cause of the just, and share in the strivings of the faithful and the good.

And be not discouraged, dear friends, to do what you may, because the desired result may seem to be remote. It is our

privilege to live in the future. An irrepressible sympathy, of which the brute knows nothing, binds us to the coming ages. And when we meet, through mercy, in that blessed Future where the faithful of all nations and all kindred shall see and know God’s final purposes of good, it will be matter of gratulation and joy that we had been permitted to lessen the sum of evil and swell the heritage of good to the generations which are to take our place, and to start in their new career of knowledge, of virtue, and of happiness, from the point at which we had left them.

Reciprocating every good wish and prayer—invoking the healthful working of God’s Holy Spirit among you, to “establish, strengthen, settle you,” as a united and a Christian people—and asking your pardon and favourable acceptance of these few hurried thoughts,—I remain, with sorrowing but sincere affection, dear brethren, your ever faithful friend, and late pastor,—

GEORGE ARMSTRONG.

OBITUARY.

Oct. 29, at his residence, Howard Hill, near Sheffield, of chronic inflammation of the lungs, Mr. CHARLES HINDE, aged 56 years. He was of a calm, gentle and sympathizing spirit, ever ready to comfort the sorrowing and minister to the wants of the distressed, as many mourning hearts can testify. He was the true friend of Sunday-schools and of every good cause; and in his own place of worship, Upper chapel, Norfolk Street, Sheffield, at which he had been a devout member a great number of years, his loss will be a void not easily filled up. He ever visited the sick and the mourning, breathing hope and consolation wherever he entered; and his friendly and affectionate counsel to all around him, whether on religious or worldly affairs, will long be remembered. He was deeply imbued with a religious spirit; and his reliance on the wisdom and goodness of God and the love of the Saviour, ever made him cheerful and happy. In his illness he was patient and resigned; not a murmur escaped his lips; his watchword, “Thy will be done.” Death had no terrors for him; it was no dark valley, but light and joy unspeakable; and with those he best loved near him, he calmly fell asleep,

and his glorified spirit passed on to a brighter land without a sigh.—The Stannington congregation, to whom he was much attached and in whose cause he took deep interest, have lost a friend and counsellor who will not soon, if ever, be replaced, and theirs has been a great sorrow. He was interred in the Old chapel-yard at Stannington, Nov. 3rd. The writer never saw such real grief. The congregation were all there. They lined the path on each side for the mourners to pass through, and every mark of respect was shewn. The pulpit, &c., was hung with black. The sorrow on every face told they had lost one they loved and honoured. There were more than two hundred persons in the chapel-yard, and it was a most affecting sight; such grief is not often seen in a crowd. Rev. Brooke Herford committed the remains to the dust, and the services for the occasion, both in the chapel and at the grave, were most beautiful and consoling. May they prove so to those who mourn, though not without hope, and whose irretrievable loss is the gain and exceeding joy of the dear departed, “who, though being dead, yet speaketh”!

M. C. O.

Nov. 16, at his house, Gateacre, near Liverpool, JAMES DAWSON RODICK, Esq., barrister-at-law, of the Inner Temple, aged 30 years. Mr. J. D. Rodick was the youngest son of the late Thomas Rodick, Esq., J.P.

Nov. 22, at University Hall, London, aged 18, THOMAS MORGAN, eldest son of Benjamin Evans, Esq., solicitor, Newcastle Emlyn, Carmarthenshire.

Nov. 30, at his residence, The Shrubbery, near Liverpool, in his 72nd year, RICHARD VAUGHAN YATES, Esq.

It is exactly a year since these columns contained an obituary notice of Mr. J. B. Yates, and it is already our painful duty to record the death of another member of the same estimable family. Mr. R. V. Yates was born at Everton, near Liverpool, July 4, 1785. He was the third son of the Rev. John Yates, the well-known and widely-respected minister of the congregation then assembling in Paradise - Street chapel; and the influence of the judicious and exemplary early training he received, was manifest throughout his life, in his affectionate reverence for the memory of his father, and in the constancy and simplicity with which he acted upon and carried out the principles in which he had been brought up. Like his deceased brother, and many other men who have occupied leading positions in the neighbouring community, he was a pupil of that able and accomplished scholar and firm advocate of civil and religious liberty, the Rev. Dr. Shepherd, of Gateacre. During the principal part of his life, Mr. R. V. Yates was actively and successfully engaged in the iron trade, from which he wholly withdrew only about two years ago. He owned also a considerable extent of building land in Toxteth Park (partly by inheritance from his father, but increased by acting on the same principle of sagacious foresight by which his father was distinguished), which the rapid increase of the town soon covered with the dwellings of an industrious population. It may be said of him, however, with emphatical truth, that what he received and economized by his thrift and prudence, he was always ready to give to the promotion of useful and charitable objects. He contributed largely and regularly to all the principal charities of his native town, taking especial interest in the education of the humbler classes. The excellent and valuable Harrington

Schools in Toxteth Park, founded by his father for the benefit of the children of the poor of all denominations (practically solving the alleged "religious difficulty" of the educational question, and now enjoying the benefit of Government aid and inspection), received his munificent aid and constant attention for upwards of thirty years; and so long as his health and strength permitted, he took delight in personally imparting instruction or amusement to the scholars. For these schools he compiled a selection from the Scriptures of those portions which he deemed most intelligible and edifying to the minds of children. Not many weeks before his death he took an active part in contributing to the enjoyment of upwards of four hundred of the scholars, by his presence with them in the Prince's Park and the Dingle. Many years ago he exerted himself with indefatigable perseverance in raising the Liverpool Mechanics' Institution to the commanding position which it thenceforth assumed; and so anxious was he to establish it as a seat of useful education for the rising members of a commercial community, and so confident did he feel of its ultimate success, that he entered into a guarantee of the requisite funds, which, had he been deceived in his expectation, would have made it necessary for him to give up the beautiful residence which he had built near the Dingle, and very greatly to retrench his domestic expenditure.* Even this act of generous courage, however, was thrown into the shade by the establishment of the Prince's Park, so named from the birth of the Prince of Wales in the year 1841. So desirous was he that a place of healthful and pleasant recreation should be secured for the people from the inroads of the rapidly-extending town, that when he found himself unable to prevail upon the wealthy corporation of Liverpool to carry out his scheme, by an unexampled effort of liberality he accomplished it at his own cost. In the purchase of the land from the Earl of Sefton, surrounding it with handsome railing, and laying it out and planting under the able direction of

* We well remember hearing this fact impressively stated by the late excellent Dr. Carpenter, of Bristol, to the assembled teachers of the Lewin's-Mead Sunday-school, on his return from a visit to the North of England.

Mr. Pennethorne and Sir Joseph Paxton, with all the incidental expenses, he incurred an outlay very seriously affecting even his ample means; and, after deducting all the probable reimbursement arising from the sale of land for houses, he must be considered as having made a present to the public of an amount which we cannot venture to estimate. We fear we may add that the multiplicity of harassing business consequent on this great undertaking, has latterly proved a heavy burden for his failing health to cope with.

Mr. Yates was conscientiously attentive to his duties as a Justice of the Peace for the borough of Liverpool, and, when his health and strength permitted, as a member of the Town Council. In the former capacity, he often took part in making a stand against the multiplying applications for spirit licences, from a benevolent conviction of their baneful tendency.

In the various and manifold relations of his busy and useful life, he was distinguished throughout by his single-hearted conscientiousness, benevolence and humility. Whatever he deemed it to be his duty to do, that he did with literal exactness and straightforward simplicity, cheerfully regardless of ridicule or censure, and seemingly unconscious of the existence of such an emotion as false shame. A Liberal in politics and a Dissenter in religion, he was always true to the principles which he conscientiously advocated, yet with an enlarged charity towards those who differed from him, which exempted him from having a single enemy amongst his political or theological opponents.

By virtue of his simplicity of character, which prompted him always to do what he deemed right or desirable to be done, his life exhibited some of the features of genius, creating around him—as in the Mechanics' Institution, the Prince's Park and his private residence—tangible results of signal utility or unique beauty, at which a less unsophisticated nature might have deemed it hopeless to aim. His own house and grounds (which it was always his delight to make subservient to the pleasure of others by the most generous and unrestricted hospitality) were full of all that nature and art could combine to render pleasing to a refined and graceful taste. His mind delighted to dwell on all that was beautiful and lovely in the works of God or the inspirations of human genius, though it did not shrink from the nobler and

more arduous work of ministering to suffering and mitigating evil.

Partly in the indulgence of an eager and intelligent curiosity, and partly for the benefit of his feeble health, he travelled at various times into Italy and Greece, and also into Egypt, Syria and Palestine; in which last journey he invited Miss Harriet Martineau to join his party, who was thus enabled to give to the world her graphic and interesting work on "Life in the East."

Whether in the support of useful or charitable institutions, in encouraging what some might be disposed to characterize as Quixotic or Utopian schemes of a too sanguine benevolence, or in the exercise of private charity, he was ever ready to the extent of the means with which Providence had blessed him. We feel bound to say this, though, could his own wishes be consulted, we fear that in saying it we should be giving him pain; for any grateful acknowledgment of his generous kindness always seemed to be repudiated by him with the most unaffected and shrinking humility; whilst, on the other hand, he repaid the slightest manifestations of kindness or affection towards himself with expressions of gratitude that were touchingly excessive. But though we know how he would have deprecated this tribute, we cannot but deem it a duty on our part to pay it. We have lost one of whom we can unfeignedly say—

"He was a man, take him for all in all,
We shall not look upon his like again."

It was the humble and earnest aim of his life to set before himself the holy and perfect example of Jesus Christ as his pattern and guide; and in his regular attendance on the services of the house of prayer, as well as in the daily devotions of the household and the closet, he ever delighted to draw nigh unto his Heavenly Father, through faith in His beloved Son.

We hardly need add that, wide and generous as were his sympathies, he was devotedly attached to the Unitarian form of Christian faith. Rarely indeed was his place vacant, when at home and in sufficient health, at the services of the Ancient Chapel of Toxteth Park, and it was edifying and delightful to witness the simplicity and fervour with which, to the very last, he joined in singing praises to the universal Father. Never did he refuse such help as he could give to a useful or benevolent association, a struggling

and deserving school or congregation of the Unitarian body, from whatever part of the kingdom—we may almost say, from whatever part of the world—the appeal might come. He was a liberal supporter of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, the Liverpool Domestic Mission, Manchester College, the Home Missionary Board and the Ministers' Benevolent Society; and he was one of the munificent contributors to the recently established Rawdon Fund. He exemplified the possibility of earnestness in the belief and furtherance of his simple, cheerful, benevolent and hopeful view of the truth as it is in Jesus, together with the utmost charity and catholic liberality of spirit towards those who laid emphatic stress on doctrines repugnant to his own. He was a Christian indeed, in whom there was no guile. At his funeral, which was conducted with characteristic simplicity, the body being borne from his house to its last home without hearse or coaches, the Ancient Chapel was crowded with sympathizing friends, amongst whom, in addition to the relatives (including the High Sheriff of the county, Mr. R. N. Philips, and Mr. H. S. Thompson, of Thingwall), were two of the former ministers of the chapel, the Rev. J. H. Thom and the Rev. C. Wicksteed, the Rev. Jas. Martineau, the Rev. F. Bishop, Mr. J. C. Ewart, M.P. for Liverpool, Mr. Thos. Thornely, M.P., Messrs. W. and R. Rathbone, Mr. Thos. Bolton, Mr. G. Holt, Mr. James Mulleneux, Mr. John Aikin, and many others of various forms of faith. The attendance on the following Sunday was even more crowded, on which occasion the minister of the chapel took for his subject "Christian Humility," as characteristic of the deceased.* In the afternoon of the same day, a crowded assembly of children and others at the Harrington School-rooms, was impressively addressed by the Rev. J. H. Thom, from the words, beautifully appropriate to the occasion and to the childlike simplicity of the deceased, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Immediately on the announcement of Mr. Yates's death, the flag at the

Liverpool Town Hall was hoisted half-mast high, in token of respect for his memory; and at a meeting of the Town Council in the same week, a resolution expressive of respectful sympathy was unanimously adopted, after being moved with warm and appreciating eloquence by Alderman S. Holme (a zealous Churchman and Conservative), and seconded by the late Mayor, Mr. John Stewart, who related from his own knowledge, as agent to the Earl of Sefton, the history of the origin of the Prince's Park.

Mr. Yates will be long and deeply mourned, not merely in his private circle as a devoted husband, a beloved brother and a kind and valued friend, but in a wider sphere, as a benefactor of his native town and a zealous and consistent adherent of freedom, truth and peace. May his departure, however, mournful and trying though it be, leave behind the most appropriate memorial, by stimulating those who lament it to exemplify in themselves the same Christian qualities of meek simplicity, self-denying benevolence and cheerful faith in God!

J. R.

Dec. 22, at Edgbaston, near Birmingham, aged 61, ANN, third daughter of the late THOMAS LAKIN HAWKES, of that town.

REV. EPHRAIM PEABODY, D.D.—A blow long expected has at length fallen on the family and parish of this estimable pastor, engaging preacher and brilliant writer. He passed to his eternal rest at half-past nine o'clock on the morning of the 28th November, at his residence in Chambers Street. Wide is the regret at the departure of so good a man, and so admired a minister and pulpit orator. But there is no regret for him. He has gone to realize his long-cherished anticipation of the celestialized beatitudes of his Master. As a preacher, good sense, the avoidance of extremes, a keen insight into human nature and a sympathy with its trials and temptations, marked his discourses. His eloquence was the eloquence of profound conviction; his emphatic earnestness that of one who believed every word he uttered, and who uttered every word because he believed. Intolerant of cant, he was fervent in spirit. Free from superstition, he was profoundly reverent. Dignified in his perfect naturalness, he magnified his office by his evident sincerity.—*American Paper.*

* The sermon and funeral service, together with part of the present notice and the proceedings of the Liverpool Town Council referred to below, are being published, by the request of the family, in a separate form.